Class LA7 Book M3P4
General Theological Seminary Library
Ninth Ave. and 20th St., New York.
Beside the main topic, this book also treats of
Subject No. On page | Subject No. On page

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T3-CBT-180

MANT ON THE RUBRICS.

AN

EXPLANATION

OF

THE RUBRICS

IN THE

Book of Common Prayer,

WITH

SPECIAL REFERENCE TO UNIFORMITY IN CONDUCTING THE SERVICE.

BY THE

RT. REV. RICHARD MANT, D. D.,

LATE BISHOP OF DOWN AND CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

WITH

NOTES AND ADDITIONS,

TO ADAPT IT TO USE IN THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

BY

W. D. WILSON, D. D.,

TRINITY PROFESSOR OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS, ETC., IN HOBART FREE COLLEGE, AT GENEVA, AUTHOR OF "THE CHURCH IDENTIFIED," "HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND," ETC., ETC.

NEW YORK:

H. B. DURAND, 49 WHITE ST.

1864.

35311

Lit
1900K
M318:4

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

INTRODUCTORY LETTER.

To the Rev. Benjamin Hale, *President of Geneva College, and Doctor in Divinity.*

Rev. and Dear Sir:—As my part in bringing this Edition of Bishop Mant's *Horæ Liturgicæ* before the public, was undertaken at your suggestion and by your request, I feel anxious that it should appear in connection with your name. Not that I would imply thereby, that all that I have here said by way of Notes and Additions has received your approval, (as you have seen but a small part of it,) or that I would hold you in any measure responsible for the opinions I have advanced. But it is due to the public and to yourself, that it should be known that the object and plan of editing this work are of your own suggesting, that they may know to whom they are indebted for the merits of that part of the work, (which are certainly very great,) while all of the imperfections in its execution, be they what they may, are justly chargeable on myself alone.

It remains only that I should give a brief account of what I have done.

And the first thing requiring notice in this place, is the liberty I have taken with the text of the Rt. Rev. Author. I have reduced his Two Letters into one. This is a liberty which I most certainly should not have taken, if I had not been assured that the form in which it was published by him was not one devised and matured by himself before he commenced writing. On the contrary, it appears that when he wrote the first Letter on Liturgical Discrepancy, he had no design of writing the second. In the first, he only pointed out the Discrepancies, and suggested some weighty considerations in favor of their removal. But the Clergy of his diocese wishing for further instructions on the subject, he wrote his second Letter, supplementary to the first, going over the same ground, and giving his opinions as to what is the right way in regard to each of the Discrepancies enumerated in the first Letter, answering the apologies for discrepancy, and refuting the objections that are urged against uniformity.

I can hardly doubt, that, if his lordship had contemplated the second Letter when he wrote the first, he would have incorporated them into one, in manner and form nearly as I have taken the liberty to do In accomplishing this, I have not found it necessary

to omit or change any thing, except some references in the Letters to things contained in the Letters themselves, so as that the references as they now stand may be understood as pointing to the same things as they did in their previous form. I have also followed the usual form of placing the refutation of objections to uniformity before the reasons which should induce to its observance.

I hope that this liberty which I have taken with the Rt. Rev. Author's arrangement, while it will add greatly to the convenience of the use of his valuable Letters, will not be displeasing to his lordship, if it should ever come to his knowledge, as I hope it may.

My Notes I have thought best to incorporate in the body of the book itself, as they are of such a character as to require the same attention as the other matter contained in it, being designed to modify his lordship's statements, as the circumstances and peculiarities of our Church require.

In my Additions, I have gone over the most frequently used of the Occasional Offices. I have there explained sufficiently the motives and principles by which I was guided. My object has not been to point out all the discrepancies that exist, nor yet to set forth the most common usage; but to give that direction which seems most in conformity with the

general principles and the best authorities relating to subjects specially treated of.

There are two other points in regard to which I would say a word.

The use of the "*Amen.*" In regard to this, I have followed the last standard edition of the Book of Common Prayer, set forth A. D. 1844. I have given in its place an extract from the Report of the Committee of Revision, showing the rule which they intended to establish, by their manner of printing the word. The application of this rule leads, as I confess, in a few instances to results which, in my private judgment, I should have had otherwise. I should have stated the rule thus—Whenever the Amen is printed in the Roman letter, it is to be pronounced by the same person or persons as the part of the service to which it is appended: thus, in the GENERAL CONFESSION, LORD'S PRAYER, CREED, &c., *by both Minister and People;* in the OFFICIAL FORMULA OF BAPTISM, &c., *by the Minister only;* and in the FORM OF ENDOWMENT in the Marriage Service, by "*the man*" *only.*

The Amen and its use is derived from the Bible, and we should undoubtedly be guided in our use of it by its usage there. It is there used by *the people*, in response to comminations, prayers, and thanksgivings, by the minister, in *Deut.* xxvii. 15, &c., 1 *Cor.* xiv.

16, and other places. It is also used by the speaker himself to give emphasis to what he says. This is common in the language and discourses of our Saviour, where it is translated by "*verily*," and in the epistles of St. Paul, where it stands Anglicised, but not translated. But I know of no scripture precedent for the minister and people to join in a response to what either of them has said alone.

It may be said that the adoption of the typography recommended by the Committee and by the General Convention, does not imply an adoption of the principles and reasonings on account of which they recommended it. Still, however, I have not felt at liberty to take this view of the subject.

It will be observed that the resolution of the House of Bishops, A. D. 1835, does not go quite so far in the application of this rule as the Report above referred to. That resolution says—"It is also the opinion of the Bishops, that in those parts of the Liturgy in which the minister and people *unite in saying the whole*, as in the CONFESSION, the CREEDS, the LORD'S PRAYER, the GLORIA IN EXCELSIS, the TRISAGION, and the last PRAYER FOR ASH WEDNESDAY, the word '*Amen*' should be printed in the Roman letters, and the minister unite with the people in saying it." But this does not reach the cases specified by the Committee, where the congregation and people are directed to

respond together to what one of them has said alone, as in the Baptismal Formula, and in the Marriage Service. This resolution of the House of Bishops, in 1835, would accord precisely with my view of the use of the "Amen;" and I would also adopt and approve of the typography in regard to it which the joint committee recommended, and the General Convention adopted on their recommendation; only I would vary their rule, as I have just stated in a preceding paragraph.

It will be recollected, however, that the Report was drawn up and the principle stated, with these cases in view, by the Rev. Dr. Coit. Few persons that are acquainted with that gentleman's usual habits of thought and investigation, will feel disposed to suspect him of inadvertency, or to look for errors in his statements of facts. The report also received the special attention of the Rev. Dr. Wainwright. And if one had any fear that an error had escaped the research and accuracy of the first named reverend gentleman, that fear, I apprehend, would entirely subside when he considers the part which the reverend gentleman last named took in the matter.

With this view, I have yielded my private opinion, and consider the Church as having now sanctioned the rule laid down in the report above referred to.

The other point of remark in this place, is the

difference between the situation of the English Church and our own in respect to written laws. In England, authorities of this kind, to be appealed to as settling all controversy, are far more extensive than they are in our own country. I have regarded the declaration in the Preface to our Prayer Book—*this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline or worship;* OR *further than local circumstances require*—as authorizing an appeal to the English law, or sanctioned usage, in all cases where there had been no express action of our Church to render such an appeal inadmissible, or where there were no "local circumstances" that positively "require" a different usage. I have found this principle an essential aid, and have kept it constantly in view.

Still there are cases in which something different is found necessary; as, for instance, in the use of metrical singing. These cases, however, are but very few and unimportant. There is much more difficulty in determining precisely where and how far our Church has intended to depart from the English. The safe way, under the circumstances, is undoubtedly not to suppose a departure where there are not clear indications that one was intended.

Under the guidance of these principles, and in this way, my Rev. Brother, have I accomplished the task

which, at your suggestion, I have undertaken in the service of our common Mother in Christ. I am not sure that all of the opinions which I have advanced will coincide with your own, (though I hope there will be no serious discrepancies between us,) and I am quite sure that the work is far less perfectly done than it would have been if your multipled and important duties would have allowed you to undertake it yourself.

I have the honor, Rev. and Dear Sir,
With much gratitude for the privilege,
To be your Friend and Brother in the
Ministry of Christ.
W. D. WILSON.

CHRIST'S CHURCH PARSONAGE,
Sherburne, Western New-York, April 14th, 1847.

TO THE

MOST REVEREND AND RIGHT REVEREND

THE

SPIRITUAL RULERS AND GUARDIANS

OF THE

United Church of England and Ireland,

THIS HUMBLE EFFORT TO PROMOTE

PAROCHIAL AND DIOCESAN EDIFICATION,

IS, WITH EARNEST PRAYER FOR THEIR PROSPERITY,

INSCRIBED BY ONE OF THEIR BRETHREN:

WHO, WITH ALL BECOMING RESPECT AND DEFERENCE,

MAKES BOLD TO RECORD HIS CONVICTION,

THAT THE APPOINTED PATHWAY

TO GOD'S BLESSING ON THE CHURCH

IS THROUGH THE RELIGIOUS UNITY OF HER CHILDREN;

AND THAT SUCH UNITY CANNOT BE ATTAINED

WITHOUT OBEDIENCE TO THE CHURCH'S

AUTHORITY AND DECREES.

TO THE READER.

Different Clergymen of my diocese, having felt uncertainty about some particulars in our celebration of public worship, have recently followed the instructions of the Church, and referred their questions to their Diocesan. For, in her Preface "Concerning the Service of the Church," her ministers and people are instructed, "Forasmuch as nothing can be so plainly set forth, but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same; to appease all such diversity (if any arise) and for the resolution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute, the things contained in this Book; the parties that so doubt, or diversely take any thing, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to any thing contained in this Book."

These references have revived my attention to a subject which occupied it some months ago, when I

committed to paper my thoughts on the prevailing Liturgical Discrepancy in the Church; on its concomitant evils; and, if God will give us his blessing, on its remedy. Having now again re-considered the subject, I am more and more convinced of its great and general importance: and not remembering to have seen it put forward exactly under the aspects, under which it has offered itself to my contemplation, I venture to submit to the Reader the following sentiments, as my humble offering of duty to the Church, and with the earnest hope of contributing, under the divine blessing, to the furtherance of uniformity in her worship.

Such is the purport of the following letters, wherein will be found a considerable number of liturgical discrepancies; some of comparatively minor importance, considered abstractedly, but of great general and collective moment, as exemplifying a serious evil.

To the letters I have added a Charge to Candidates for holy orders; presenting the subject under such views as are suggested by the prefatory contents of our Common Prayer Book.

DUBLIN,
Advent, 1844.

NOTE.

THE whole of this Book was printed, before the Author was aware of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Letter to the Clergy and Laity of his Province. Still it would not have been published, if the Author had supposed that the slightest want of respect would seem to be thereby shown to his Grace; or if he had been led, on due inquiry, to think that it would incur his Grace's disapprobation, or interfere with the laudable and benevolent objects of his Grace's provincial letter.

The fact indeed is, that the present work takes but little notice of the topics of recent controversy; and then only as examples, in common with others, of the general subject.

With reference, however, to one particular topic, and in order to remove a possible stumbling-block, he would here observe, that, although he can discover no authority for the use of a black gown in the pulpit, as noticed in page 77, and therefore cannot approve of it; yet he refrains now, as heretofore, from pressing his exceptions against it, where a Clergyman, for peace' sake, is disposed, and judges himself warranted, to adopt it. A similar remark applies to the use of a Collect before the Sermon, noticed in page 79.

DUBLIN,

Feb. 5, 1845.

LITURGICAL DISCREPANCY:

ITS EXTENT, EVIL, AND REMEDY:

IN TWO LETTERS

(REDUCED TO ONE)

TO

THE CLERGY OF DOWN AND CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

Πάντα δοκιμάζετε· τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε. *Τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖτε.*
1 THESS. v. 21. 2 COR. v. 11.

LETTER.

Rev. and dear Sir,

Pastoral communications from myself to those, to whom by God's will I have been placed in the relation wherein I stand to you and your diocesan brethren, have always appeared to me to form an integral and important part of my duty. You have accordingly, I trust, found me at all times willing to receive from you inquiries, whether personally or by letters, on matters affecting your own parochial engagements individually, and to answer them as my information and judgment have enabled me. On matters of general concern opportunities have been taken for acquainting you with my views at the periodical visitation: and for an occasion of that sort I should probably reserve the subject of the present communication, if it did not embrace various

particulars of detail, which seem not well suited to a charge from the episcopal chair. The present form, therefore, of a pastoral letter has been chosen for bringing before you the following sentiments, to which I solicit your serious and conscientious deliberation: for I have been long and strongly persuaded, and, the more I reflect, the more is my persuasion strengthened, that an observance of what is now about to be recommended would sensibly and greatly improve the good order, harmony, edification, and honorable character, of our diocese; at the same time it would remove from amongst us a pretext often made in justification of their schism by those who separate themselves from the Church; and, so far as the well-being of a body may be implicated in the condition of a member, it would advance the good estate of the Church in general to the glory and praise of God.

The cause of my letter is the fact, which, important as it is, is not commonly estimated as it deserves; namely, the discrepancy which is apt to prevail among the clergy in their celebration of divine service. The fact

I assume to be indisputable. It is my present purpose, with God's blessing, to draw your thoughts to a just appreciation of it. And, in order thereto, first to exemplify it by going progressively, but as succinctly as may be, through the Morning Service, as celebrated in our parish churches: secondly, to exhibit the character and consequences of the discrepancy: and thirdly, to propose a remedy, if a remedy shall have appeared desirable.

I. In the following enumeration of Liturgical Discrepancies, it is my object to show by examples, in some degree, the extent of the evil, to which I am solicitous for seeing the application of a remedy. And I should have contented myself with specifying such instances of the fact, without expressing an opinion or offering any remark upon the several cases as they occurred.

It has however been suggested to me that it would be useful, if I were briefly to deliver my judgment upon each: that in all of them I am already aware of a difference of opinion and of practice; that on some indeed my judgment has been already given

in official charges at different times during my episcopate, but by some clergymen those charges have not been read, by others overlooked; that on certain cases particular clergymen have resorted to me already "for the resolution of doubts and for the appeasing of diversity concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute," some of "the things contained in this book;" and that upon these questions especially, and generally upon other the like topics, it would be most satisfactory both to them and to others, and conducive to Liturgical Conformity, if my judgment on the specified cases were to be delivered, as it were, *ex cathedra.*

This suggestion has been judged by me worthy of adoption: the rather, because long experience has made me aware of the doubts and difficulties on liturgical subjects which candidates for holy orders have been apt to feel, when, in the course of their examination by myself or my chaplains, those subjects have been brought under their notice; of the hesitation and uncertainty with which they frequently answer our inquiries, of the

alacrity with which they avail themselves of permission to seek satisfaction, and of the ingenuousness wherewith they receive the solutions of their questions: so that a brief manual of such instructions, commended to their careful attention by their future Bishop, would, I am persuaded, act with many of these, and of the laity likewise, as an acceptable and useful guide towards an unanimous and uniform observance of the Church's ordinances; and such a manual will probably be found in the anticipated judgment, as regards my own diocese.

In compliance then with this suggestion, to the enumeration of discrepancies it is my purpose to add my sentiments on each: stating with all possible brevity the law only, where the Church appears to have "set it forth plainly;" and where she may be supposed to have "not so plainly set it forth," in such cases stating what I believe to be her mind and intention; anxiously cautious in every case, that whatsoever I shall say "be not contrary to any thing contained" in her Book of Common Prayer, which she prescribes for the guide of my judgment.

1. In some churches the Morning Prayer is introduced by the minister "reading one or more of the sentences of the Scriptures," selected for that purpose; in others, these sentences are preceded by a psalm or a hymn; and in others, again, they are not read by the minister, but chanted by the people.

"At the beginning of Morning Prayer, *the minister*" is to "read one or more of the following sentences:" they are not to be preceded by a psalm or hymn, nor are they to be chanted by the people.

2. In "saying that which is written after the said sentences," as in other parts of the service, some ministers *read:* others use a modulation of the voice, called *intoning*, approaching to singing or chanting.

The succeeding exhortation is to be said, not with the modulation of the voice called *intoning*, but with its ordinary modulation in solemn reading or speaking. I allude to the service in parish churches, without any reference to cathedrals.

["That which is written after the said sentences,"

here spoken of, is the exhortation commencing "Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us," &c. There is no direction for the people to rise, and stand during the reading of the sentences and exhortation; though that, so far as I know, is the universal practice, and in accordance with general principle.

It may be worth while here to remark, once for all, that the Church *no where* expressly recognizes, or directs, in her Rubrics, the posture of *sitting* in church. It is, however, now the universal practice, during the Lessons, the Sermon, the Epistle of the Ante-Communion Service, and the Notices that follow, for the congregation to sit. This posture is sanctioned by general usage, and churches are furnished with *seats*, that the people may *sit;* frequently, even when they are not so arranged that they can *kneel*. It may be said, however, that the Church recognizes sitting, by sometimes directing the people to stand, or kneel, implying that they were not in that position before. This, however, can hardly be the case. For instance, the Church directs the standing posture before the *Gloria Patri*, immediately after the Lord's Prayer, and her next direction for posture is just before the Creed, which is the standing posture again. Yet, I suppose that no one would say that they should be in any other than the standing posture during the chant, that immediately precedes the direction to stand during the recital of the Creed. In the primitive times there were no seats, and there was no sitting in church at all. The posture was always either standing or kneeling, and the Church seems disinclined to recog-

nize or encourage the familiarity and irreverence implied in being seated, as if at one's leisure, in the Divine presence.]

3. The "General Confession" is "said after the minister" in different ways; some congregations following him immediately through each successive clause, others taking up each clause and repeating it apart from him.

The phrase "after the minister," in the Rubric before the "General Confession," seems indefinite, and is complied with by either of the practices specified in the enumeration. For the congregation to follow the minister immediately through each successive clause appears to me most in accordance with the spirit of the Church's provision. Or, if we look to parallel cases, the same mode of joint supplication is practiced, universally, so far as my experience and recollection serve, and, I presume, properly, in the use of similar forms in the Communion and in the Commination: in the former, at the "General Confession," where no direction is given as to the mode of saying it, but the sole direction is "both

he (the minister) and all the people kneeling humbly upon their knees, and saying;" and in the latter, at the form which commences "Turn thou us, O good Lord, and so shall we be turned," introductory to which is the direction, "Then shall the people say this that followeth after the minister." The phrase is the same in the direction prefixed to the "General Confession," at Morning and Evening Prayer; namely, that it is "to be said of the whole congregation *after the minister*." This confirms my opinion: and, if there be any objection to the mode of joint supplication which I recommend, the objection must extend to both of these similar forms, to the latter especially.

[This matter has been settled for us, by a Resolution of the House of Bishops, passed in General Convention, A. D. 1835, as follows: "It is the opinion of the Bishops, that, a regard to uniformity with what is practiced in other parts of the Liturgy, and also the avoiding a needless addition to the length of the Service, and to its most decent performance, requires that in repeating the General Confession in the Morning and Evening Prayer, the people should *unite with the minister*, in saying it after him, in the same manner as is usually practiced in saying the Creeds, the Lord's Prayer, and the Confession in the Communion Service.]

4. At the end of the "General Confession," some ministers pronounce the "Amen:" others suppress it.

At the end of the General Confession, the "Amen" should be pronounced by the minister: it is part of this act of devotion, prescribed alike for him and for the congregation.

[This matter has also been settled for us by the Bishops, A. D. 1835. "It is also their opinion, (the Bishops',) that, in those parts of the Liturgy in which the minister and people unite in saying the whole, as in the *Confession*, the *Creeds*, the *Lord's Prayer*, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Trisagion*, and *the last Prayer for Ash Wednesday*, the word "*Amen*" should be printed in Roman letters, and the minister unite with the people in saying it." The General Convention of A. D. 1844, has also, indirectly at least, added one more to the list of cases above enumerated, in which the minister should repeat the "*Amen*" with the people, viz., the *Thanksgiving* in the Baptismal Service, just after the Gospel and Exhortation, and before the Address to the Godfathers and Godmothers. This was done *indirectly*, I say, for it was not made a matter of discussion before the Convention of 1844. But, by the Committee, appointed A. D. 1841, to prepare a standard edition of the Common Prayer, and in the standing Committee on the Prayer Book, of A. D. 1844, the matter was deliberately considered.

That *Thanksgiving* was printed with the "*Amen*" in Roman letters, for the express purpose of showing that the thanksgiving should be repeated by the minister and people, and that the minister also should repeat the "*Amen*."]

5. When the officiating minister is a deacon, a priest, being present, sometimes reads the "Absolution:" sometimes it is omitted altogether. If a priest be not present, the deacon sometimes passes at once, from the "Confession" to "the Lord's Prayer:" sometimes inserts a Collect.

When a deacon officiates, a priest, if there be one present, should pronounce the absolution: if no priest be present, the deacon should pass on to the Lord's Prayer, without inserting a Collect.

6. At the end of "the Lord's Prayer," as at the end of the General Confession, ministers differ about the "Amen."

The minister, at the end of the Lord's Prayer, should audibly utter the "Amen."

[See note to the fourth Discrepancy and Opinion, above.]

7. In the Doxology that follows, the

priest sometimes says the first verse, and is answered by the people: sometimes the priest is silent, and leaves the two verses to be sung by the people.

In the ensuing Doxology, "the priest shall say" the former verse, and the "Answer" is to be given by the people.

8. In the Doxology also here, and on other occasions of its occurrence, as likewise in the Psalms and Hymns, in the Suffrages after the Creed, and in the Litany, and in other parts of the service, the responses are made, and the creeds likewise said, in some churches by the parish clerk only, sometimes by the charity school children together with the clerk, sometimes by the whole congregation.

Any substitution for the congregation at large in those parts, which the Church directs to be said by the people, abounds with objections which cannot be specified here, but which I once enlarged upon in a sermon, and circulated it among the clergy of the diocese of Down and Connor.

9. At the end of the Invitatory Psalm, "Venite, exultemus Domino," as at the end

of each psalm in the ordinary course, which consists of an uneven number of verses, some ministers repeat the first verse of the Hymn of Glory, and leave the answer to the people: others allow the people to repeat the first verse, and themselves return the answer.

After the Invitatory Psalm the Rubric says, "at the end of every psalm throughout the year, and likewise at the end of *Benedicite*, *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, and *Nunc Dimittis*, shall be repeated, Glory be to the Father, and to the Son: and to the Holy Ghost;

"*Answer.* As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen."

This apparently indicates, that the former verse of the Hymn of Glory should be said by the minister and the latter by the people: for, in cases of alternate recitation, it is the general rule, and it is agreeable to propriety, for an *answer* to be returned by the people to the minister, and not by the minister to the people.

[The Rubric before the use of the Psalter, or Selections of Psalms for the day, is not the same in

our Prayer Book as in the English. In the English, it is imperative. "And at the end of *every* psalm, throughout the year, &c., &c., *shall* be repeated, *Glory be to the Father*," &c. But in ours, this usage is left optional. "And at the end of every psalm, &c., MAY be said or sung the *Gloria Patri;* and at the end of the portion or selection for the day, SHALL be said or sung the *Gloria Patri*, or else the *Gloria in Excelsis*."

It is, therefore, left with us to the discretion of the minister, and the practice varies in regard to the *Gloria*—between the use of it at the end of every psalm, and only at the end of the whole portion.

It may not be without its use, to subjoin to the Bishop's opinion the reason upon which it is based. It is simply in the fact, that the Gloria *is not* a part of the psalm or selection but is a part of the service entirely distinct. This is seen by the fact that it does not occur in the Psalter, and also from the fact that it is used elsewhere, when no Psalter is used. Being, then, a distinct and separate part of the service, though following in immediate connection with the psalm or chant, it should be commenced as all other parts of the service are, by the minister, and responded to only by the people.

The response by the people should end with an *Amen*, as in the Burial Service.]

10. When a psalm consists of an uneven number of verses, some ministers, after the Hymn of Glory, proceed by reading them

selves the first verse of the next psalm: others leave it to the people.

Each psalm should be begun by the minister. And this will follow of course, if the Hymn of Glory be delivered, as just recommended.

[The practice in this country is generally different from that here recommended; and unless the minister adopts the rule of repeating the doxology after each psalm, I know of no reason or authority for his beginning every psalm, in this country, though the English rule, by implication at least, requires it.]

11. Before reading the psalms, some clergymen announce the day of the month, and the number of the first psalm for the day: others read without such announcement. In the manner of giving out the psalm also there is some discrepancy. Some say such a day of the month, morning [or evening] prayer, such a psalm. Some say such a morning [or evening] of the month, such a psalm. Others give the number of the psalm only, without naming the day of the month.

The most complete manner of announcing the psalms appears to be, to name the

day of the month, the time, whether it be morning or evening prayer, and the first of the psalms for the time.

12. In reading the psalms, some clergymen regulate their pauses by the colon, which occurs near the middle of each verse: others are inattentive to this sign, and are guided, as is the case with their congregations also, solely by their opinion of the signification of the words.

The stop, or colon, near the middle of each verse in the psalms and hymns, is intended for a guide to the readers. The title page of the Book of Common Prayer describes "the Psalter or Psalms of David" to be "pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches." The *point* intended is the colon, which is found in the hymns as well as in the psalms; and which is meant to regulate, not the *singing* of them only, as in fact they always do in the choral service, but the *saying* of them likewise, as they should do in parish churches. In practice they are very useful in keeping a congregation together, and preventing some from out-running others: and a clergyman

by marking the pause, denoted by the *point*, in the reading of his own verse, will set an useful example to his people, especially if he direct their attention to the existence and import of the point, and train his school-children to the observance of it.

[It will be observed that our author is here speaking of the English punctuation, which was designed as a guide to the chanting of the psalms, rather than to their meaning. In our Prayer Book, the punctuation is arranged with reference to the meaning; and, consequently, this remark of Bishop Mant has but little application to us.]

13. In proceeding to the Lessons I observe, that, on the concurrence of the Lord's day with a Saint's day, some ministers prefer the First Lesson appointed for the former, others that for the latter: and that on a Saint's day, where there is no such concurrence, the First Lesson being appointed from the Apocrypha, some ministers read it, as of course, others substitute a canonical chapter: whilst of those who read it, some announce it in the common phrase, others as a chapter of an Apocryphal Book.

In the case of the Lord's day concurring

with a Saint's day, I prefer the First Lesson for the latter, unless it be from the Apocrypha, when the Sunday Lesson from a Canonical Book may on the whole be preferable. In announcing the first lesson, if not canonical, the introduction of the word "Apocryphal" is an innovation, not authorized by the Church.

14. Before every Lesson, whether the first or the second, some ministers say, "Here beginneth such a chapter, or verse of such a chapter, of such a Book;" others vary the announcement by some such words as these, "The first Lesson, or the second Lesson, appointed for this morning's service, is such a chapter of such a Book."

To announce the chapter as "The first, or the second, Lesson appointed for this morning's service," is a departure from the rule which directs that "the minister shall say, *Here beginneth such a chapter*, or *verse of such a chapter of* such a Book."

15. At the conclusion of every Lesson, again, whilst one minister says, "Here endeth the first, or the second Lesson," another for the word "here" substitutes "thus."

After every Lesson the direction is equally precise, "*Here endeth the first*, or *the second Lesson.*"

16. Immediately after the second Lesson, some ministers proceed to the ministration of Baptism, publicly in the church, having previously appointed the sponsors to be ready at the Font with the children. Others minister baptism at other times: as, for instance, after the service, when the congregation is departed; or, it may be, using the public office in a private room. And it may be well to notice here with respect to the Evening Service, that Catechising, whilst observed by some, is very generally neglected after the second Lesson, and introduced, if at all into the church, at some other time.

The rule of the Church concerning the time and place of public Baptism, either at Morning or Evening Prayer, is plainly laid down in her Rubrics before "the Ministration," and ought to be observed. Where "a great cause and necessity" exists, baptism may be ministered "in houses:" but, for this ministration of private baptism, a special office is provided; and the public

office ought not to be used except in a church. The frequency and length of publicly catechising at Evening Prayer in the time of divine service in the church are left to the clergyman's judgment: but the total neglect of it is the breach of an order, as wise and salutary, as it is direct and plain: and the benefits of it are poorly supplied by a second sermon, and by school instruction.

[The Rubric in the English Prayer Book, after the Catechism, says, that the curate in every parish shall diligently, upon Sundays, and other Holy Days, *after* the *second Lesson* at *Evening Prayer*, openly in the church, instruct and examine the children in the Catechism. Our Rubric does not thus specify the time when this duty shall be performed. But it would obviously be out of place, and contrary to the Rubric, to introduce it here, as the Canon XLV, of 1832, requires that the Common Prayer shall be used *as established* by the authority of the General Convention of this Church.

With regard to the ministration of Baptism in this place, that is, immediately after the second Lesson, the Rubric in the American Prayer Book is quite as explicit as that in the English. "And then the Godfathers and Godmothers, and the people with the children, must be ready at the Font, either immediately after the last Lesson at Morning Prayer, or else immediately after the last Lesson at Evening Prayer

as the minister at his discretion shall appoint. And the minister coming to the Font, (which is then to be filled with pure water,) and standing there, shall say," &c.]

17. In order to the ministration of Baptism, some ministers require Godfathers and Godmothers to answer for the children: others require them not.

As a preliminary to public Baptism, "the Godfathers and Godmothers .... must be ready at the Font:" and in the progress of the service, "then shall the priest speak unto the Godfathers and Godmothers on this wise:" and, in the conclusion, "the priest shall say to the Godfathers and Godmothers this exhortation following." Thus the baptismal office can be neither commenced, nor continued, nor ended, without sponsors, unless in violation of the Church's injunctions. Nor, unless in violation of her injunctions can public Baptism be ministered, except "at the Font," and that "filled with clean water."

18. Some require for sponsors persons who are not parents of the children, and who have communicated in the holy sacra-

ment of the Lord's Supper: others are contented with parents and non-communicants. Also, some baptize at the Font: others at the Communion Table, or elsewhere, out of a moveable common household basin; or, as I have heard, out of a glass tumbler.

The Church by her Canons requires for her sponsors persons, who are not parents of the children to be baptized, and who are communicants. The law, obligatory as such, appears to me prudent withal, and wholesome.

[In our own country, I am sorry to be obliged to say, that there is no such salutary law existing, either in the form of Rubric or Canon. Parents must be admitted as sponsors, "*if it be desired*;" and thus we lose the opportunity to engage a larger number of persons in the religious instruction of each particular child. Nor do I know of any authority which would sustain a minister in refusing to admit unbelievers or schismatics as sponsors, if the parents insist upon a thing so very improper as having such persons sponsors for their children.

This thing ought not to be, and it is hardly believed that any right-minded persons would insist upon it, after its impropriety had been faithfully pointed out.]

19. In the form of ministration of holy

Baptism, some use the prescribed office, entire and unaltered: others deviate from it by omissions or modifications of the Church's language.

The ministration of Baptism is part of the Book of Common Prayer, which the Church has prescribed, and which her ministers have voluntarily and solemnly undertaken, for the guide of their ministrations: the same, without adding to or diminishing; that, and no other.

20. In the act of baptizing, some minister the sacrament by dipping the child, or pouring water over it, or sprinkling it with water, once only: others by trine immersion, dipping it, or sprinkling it, or pouring water on it, on mention of each Person of the Holy Trinity.

The dipping of the child in the water, or the pouring of water upon it, is left by the Church to the discretion of her minister, according to the circumstances of the case. Trine immersion, which was directed in an early age of the Reformation, was afterwards withdrawn, together with some other

ceremonies, to endeavor the revival of which is unauthorized and reprehensible.

[As the uniformity of our service is in some cases disturbed by this irregularity, it may be well to be a little more precise on this point. The first Prayer Book of Edward VI., directed the trine immersion. "Here the priest shall take the child in his hands, and ask the name, and naming the child, shall dip it in the water thrice. First, dipping the right side; second, the left side; the third time dipping the face towards the Font, so it be discreetly and warily done, saying," &c.

The Rubric in this place, in the second Prayer Book of Edward VI., is altered, as follows: "Here the priest shall take the child in his hands, and ask the name, and naming the child, shall dip it in the water, so it be discreetly done; saying," &c.

This change, as it is well known, was made expressly for the purpose of discontinuing the use of a trine immersion, and at the importunity of the more ultra party in the work of reformation.

But it was done by the Church, and she has never seen fit to restore the usage or to alter her Rubric in this particular; and, therefore, this stands as the expression of her instructions and the command of her authority.]

21. All ministers probably sign the fore-

head of the baptized with the sign of the cross: but whereas some limit this emblem, as the Church does, to those who are thus received into the congregation of Christ's flock, others adopt the emblem, and apply it to themselves, on different occasions during divine service. But of this practice I am not aware as existing in the Irish Church.

The use of the sign of the cross in baptism was retained for just reasons by the Church: on all other occasions she rejected it, and so it should be refrained from by her members.

22. After the first Lesson, some clergymen confine themselves exclusively to the *Te Deum*; and after the second Lesson, to the *Jubilate*, or the 100th Psalm. Instead of the *Te Deum*, others occasionally use the Canticle, called *Benedicite*; and frequently choose the *Benedictus* in preference to the *Jubilate*.

With respect to the constant preference of the *Te Deum* to the *Benedicite*, and of the *Jubilate* to the *Benedictus*, that question is left by the Church to the discretion of her ministers. It would however proba-

bly be most agreeable to her intention, that of the two songs of praise, in these cases provided by her, each should sometimes be used. In the latter case especially, the position of the *Benedictus* before the *Jubilate* in our Liturgy, and its origin and character as strictly a Christian Hymn, may seem to claim for it at least an equal portion of our observance with the 100th psalm: and may even give ground for an opinion, that the hymn, rather than the psalm, was intended for general use.

[The *Jubilate* is placed *before* the *Benedictus* in our Prayer Book.]

23. For the "Confession of our Christian faith," at this period of the service, instead of the customary "Apostles' Creed," some ministers, on certain appointed days, read "the Creed of St. Athanasius." Others abstain altogether from reading the latter.

The use of "the Creed of St. Athanasius" on the appointed days is imperative on the Church's ministers and people. "Upon these Feasts," she says, naming them, "shall be sung or said at Morning Prayer, instead

of the Apostles' Creed, this Confession of our Christian faith."

[The Creed of St. Athanasius has been left out of our Liturgy; and the choice of the minister is, therefore, between the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene.]

24. In the reading of this creed, some ministers adopt the practice, usual in reading the other psalms, of alternate recitation with their people. Others read it throughout followed by their people, after the manner of recitation used in the Apostles' Creed. Others read it like one of the Lessons, the people not following.

This duty is enjoined upon "the minister and people standing." The mode is not specified: but the division of the Creed into verses, after the manner of the psalms and hymns, seems to indicate the like mode of delivery, which is in my opinion preferable to the mode used in the Apostles' Creed, which is a more continuous composition. The singing of the Athanasian Creed, as well as of the Apostles', though permitted by the Church, is less suited to a common parochial congregation, than the saying of it.

[The repetition of the Creeds by the people, *uniting with* the minister, is recognized by the House of Bishops, A. D. 1835, as the usual and legitimate practice in this country. See under Opinion 4th.]

25. Passing to the Prayers, in "the first Collect of the day," the practices of clergymen vary from each other on occasions of a Sunday coinciding with a Saint's day. Some on such occasions read one Collect only, with a preference of this or that, according to their respective judgments: others read both the Collects.

When a Saint's day coincides with the Lord's day, I prefer the Collect for the former, which gives occasion for carrying into effect the Church's mind in the special celebration, at the same time that due reverence is shown for the divine appointment. The reading of both Collects is not agreeable to the provision of the Church, who says "then shall follow three Collects; the first of the day." On Good Friday there are more than one "of the day," indeed there are three; but then they are set forth as "the Collects," particularized as such in their proper place. During the second, third, and fourth weeks

of Advent, the Collect for the first Sunday is ordered "to be repeated every day with the other Collects" for those days respectively; and every day in Lent, the Collect for Ash Wednesday, and on each of the holy days after our Lord's Nativity, the Collect for Christmas day is ordered "to be read after the Collect appointed for the day:" in all these cases there being but one "Collect of the day." To use two, unless by these special ordinances of the Church, is at variance with her law.

[The American Rubric here varies considerably from the English; and the most material variation for us now to notice, is the fact that our Rubric requires that the Collect for the day be omitted when the Communion Service (the Ante-Communion Service, of which it is a part, is probably intended) is used. Here two things are specially to be noticed:

1. In some cases it is found convenient to use the Morning Prayer early in the morning, and assemble again towards midday for the Communion Service. In this case, "the Collect for the day" should be used, inasmuch as the Communion Service is not read in immediate connection with the Morning Prayer.

2. The Rubric, "Then shall follow the Collect for the day, except when the Communion Service is

read, and then the Collect shall be omitted here," implies that there may be some days on which the Communion Service is *not* read. This is so. By Communion Service, the Ante-Communion Service is probably intended, in this place. The Rubric, therefore, implies that there may be some days on which the Morning Prayer is to be used, when the Ante-Communion Service may be omitted. What, then, are they? In answer to this question, I would say, that they are all those days for which a Collect, Epistle, and Gospel are not specially provided; that is, all days except SUNDAYS, and other HOLY DAYS, mentioned in the "Table of Lessons for Holy Days," for each of which a Collect, Epistle, and Gospel are specially provided. I shall, in another place, give the authority which obliges, in this country, to the use of the Ante-Communion Service on all these days, (if we have worship at all,) and therefore omit it here.

But if the Ante-Communion Service, though it *may be* omitted, is nevertheless used on the days for which no Epistle, Collect, &c., are appointed, then, as the Rubric says, "The Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed for the Sunday shall serve all the week after, when it is not otherwise ordered."

This Rubric of course points out the Collect to be used in the Morning Prayer when the Ante-Communion Service is omitted; namely, that for the Sunday next preceding, except when it is otherwise ordered by the Rubric or title among "the Collects, &c., to be used throughout the year." Thus, on all Sundays,

and other Holy Days, the Collect is to be used in the Ante-Communion Service, and not in the Morning Prayer. But on all other days, it must be used in its place in the Morning Prayer.

As this is a subject that not unfrequently occasions some embarrassment to the minister, especially the more inexperienced, I will be a little more explicit in stating the rules, with regard to the use of the Collect for the day.

1. The Ante-Communion Service *must be used* on *all* SUNDAYS, and *all the other* HOLY DAYS, for which proper Lessons and a Collect, Epistle and Gospel, are provided.

2. But as there may sometimes be a concurrence of Sundays with other Holy Days, I will subjoin the following table, taken from the "Church Almanac" for 1847, exhibiting the Sundays and other Holy Days which may possibly concur:

Superior Days taking precedence.	*Inferior Days.*
Advent Sunday may concur with	St. Andrew.
Fourth Sunday in Advent	St. Thomas.
St. Stephen; St. John; the Holy Innocents; and the Circumcision of our Lord	The first Sunday after Christmas.
Epiphany	The second Sunday after Christmas
Conversion of St. Paul	The third Sunday after Epiphany.
Purification	The fourth Sunday after Epiphany, and Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima Sundays.
Septuagesima, and Sexagesima Sundays	Conversion of St. Paul.
Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima Sundays; Ash Wednesday; and the first, second, and third Sundays in Lent	St. Matthias.

Superior Days taking precedence.	*Inferior Days*
Annunciation	The third, fourth, and fifth Sundays in Lent.
The Sunday before Easter; Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday in Passion Week; Good Friday; Easter Even; Easter Day; and Easter Monday, and Easter Tuesday	Annunciation.
Easter Day	St. Mark.
The first Sunday after Easter	St. Mark; and St. Philip and St. James.
St. Mark; and St. Philip and St. James	The second, third, fourth, and fifth Sundays after Easter.
Whit Sunday; and Trinity Sunday; Whit Monday, and Whit Tuesday	St. Barnabas.
Ascension Day	St. Philip and St. James.
St. Barnabas	The first, second, and third Sundays after Trinity.
St. John Baptist	The first, second, third, fourth, and fifth Sundays after Trinity.
St. Peter	The first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth Sundays after Trinity.
St. James	The fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth Sundays after Trinity.
St. Bartholomew	The tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth Sundays after Trinity.
St. Matthew	The fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth Sundays after Trinity.
St. Luke	The eighteenth, nineteenth, twentieth, twenty-first and twenty-second Sundays after Trinity.
All Saints	The twentieth, twenty-first, twenty-second, twenty-third, and twenty-fourth Sundays after Trinity.

Now when there is such a concurrence the question arises, which day shall take the precedence? It is believed that the one placed in the left hand column, called above the *Superior Day*, should do so. This,

as will be seen above, is Bishop Mant's opinion. In this opinion coincides WHEATLEY, (recommended by our House of Bishops.) He thinks that the Lessons for the Superior Day should also be read, in preference to those for the Inferior, except when one of them is taken from the Apocrypha, in which case the corresponding Lesson for the Inferior Day should be used instead.

3. On all OTHER DAYS, that is, on all days except Sunday and other Holy Days, the Ante-Communion Service *may* be omitted; and then should come in the Collect for the day here, in the place in the Morning Prayer of which we are speaking.

4. To determine what is "the Collect for the day," the following things are to be observed:

(1). "The Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed for the SUNDAY shall serve for all the week after, *when it is not in the Prayer Book* otherwise ordered."

(2). Here note that CHRISTMAS, (when it is not on Sunday,) ASH WEDNESDAY, and ASCENSION DAY, which, in the language of Wheatley, seem to begin a *new season*, form an exception to that rule; so that the Collect, &c., for each of these days is to be used on each of the week days following it, until the next succeeding Sunday. And the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the Festival of the CIRCUMCISION, which occurs on the first day of January, is to serve for every day after until the *Epiphany*, even if one of those days be a Sunday, as often happens.

(3). We are also to observe, that the Collect for the first Sunday in Advent is to be repeated *every day* in

Advent, with the other Collect, as by rule first above, until Christmas. The Collect for Ash Wednesday is also to be repeated every day in Lent, after the *Collect for the day*, as by rule first above. And on St. Stephen's Day, (Dec. 26,) St. John the Evangelist's Day, (Dec. 27,) and on Holy Innocents', (Dec. 28,) the Collect for *Christmas Day* (which is to be repeated every day from Christmas until the eve before New Year, or the Circumcision) is to be repeated also, with the Collect for these Holy Days respectively.]

26. Some give out the Collect before reading it, saying, "The Collect for such a Sunday:" others read the Collect in common course, without announcing it.

To name the Collect for the day has no authority, and is an unbecoming interruption of divine service.

27. After the third Collect, in some churches, the minister suspends the prayers for the introduction of a psalm; "In quires and places where they sing, here followeth the Anthem;" in others he proceeds without interruption to the "Litany."

After the third Collect, the Rubric says, "In quires and places where they sing, here followeth the Anthem." When this Rubric

was framed, metrical versions of the psalms were not in existence: since that time, however, royal authority has been given for the use of some such, which have accordingly been adopted in most other "places where they sing," or in our parish churches, the "anthem," technically so called, being left to the "quires." Psalmody, authorized as it is, may be well accounted a legitimate parochial substitute for the choral anthem: and, conformably to the evident spirit, if not to the strict letter of the law, this is its proper situation in our service. But for more edification, and in accordance with the Church's principles, it is well that psalmody be adapted to her liturgical provisions. In order to this, selections of psalms are desirable, appropriated to particular Sundays and Holydays. Such selections have been for a long time used in the diocese. And one, embracing the advantages of those which preceded, with enlargements and improvements, has been recently constructed and put forward, with my approbation, by the Archdeacon of Down.

[We have no Rubric directing singing in this place,

and of course no justification for its use; and besides, it would be contrary to Canon XLV. of 1832, which directs that "every minister shall, before all sermons and lectures, and on all other occasions of public worship, use the Book of Common Prayer, as the same is or may be established by the authority of the General Convention of this Church."

Our prayer for the President of the United States, &c., comes before we pass to the Litany. But in the English Service, the prayer for the civil rulers does not come before they pass to the Litany; and consequently they have, in their Litany, a more distinct mention of that part of the persons for whom we should pray than we have.]

28. In the commencement of the "Litany," occurs a discrepancy similar to that noticed in the "General Confession," as to the combined, or distinct, invocation of the Godhead by the minister and the congregation.

For the invocations at the beginning of the Litany no rule is prescribed. Possibly, however, the repetition of each sentence severally may give countenance to the supposition that each should be recited severally, first by the minister and then by the people. And yet in parochial use, whatever may be thought of the choral service, I am

of opinion, that, as in the case of the "General Confession," the putting up of these addresses by the congregation together with the minister, rather than independently of him, falls in better with the Church's spirit of combined adoration.

[The practice in this country is different from that here recommended, and there is at least the authority of a continued and general use against it. No one, I apprehend, would be justified in making a change for the purpose of following the authority of Bishop Mant in this country. His authority is binding, *as authority*, upon the clergy of his own diocese. But it has no such binding force here; nor, however highly we may esteem it, can it be in this country, or out of his own diocese, a justification for an innovation, even though the course he recommends may be intrinsically better than that in use.]

29. In the Litany, when any person is to be prayed for, some clergymen introduce the words "especially him or her, for whom our prayers are desired:" others confine themselves to announcing at the beginning of the Litany, that the prayers of the congregation are desired for such and such persons.

The omission of all allusion to the individuals, for whom prayers are desired, in the supplication for "all sick persons," seems an indication that no special commemoration should be made of them in the Litany.

30. In the course of the Litany, twice occur the hortatory words, "Let us pray:" these words are pronounced by some clergymen, and omitted by others.

The short exhortation to prayer, occasionally occurring in the Litany and elsewhere, should by no means be omitted or slurred over as of no account, but should be enunciated with deliberate seriousness.

31. Amongst the occasional prayers which follow, is one entitled, "In the Ember weeks, to be said every day for those that are to be admitted into Holy Orders." Some ministers are careful to read this or the alternative prayer at the canonical seasons: others are apt to neglect it. With respect to the former class also there is a difference as to reading it every day in the Ember week, or every Ember day, the Wednesday, namely, the Friday, and Saturday. Some also read it on the Sunday of the ordination.

So also should one of the prayers "in the Ember weeks" be devoutly said: and, in my opinion, "on every day" in the week: beginning with the Sunday before the first Ember day, but not continued on the Ordination Sunday.

32. The "Prayer for the High Court of Parliament," is "to be read during their Session." Some ministers accordingly read it from the opening of the Session to the prorogation: others disuse it during a recess or long adjournment.

Notwithstanding a recess or adjournment of Parliament, the Session is continued: so that the prayer should be read until the prorogation, whereby it is terminated.

[Instead of this, we have a prayer for Congress, to be used during their Session; and the authority seems to require it to be used every day, morning as well as evening, while they continue in Session. But they are not in Session except when assembled at Washington.]

33. At about this period of the service, some ministers introduce "the Churching of Women:" either before "the General Thanksgiving," during which they make

particular allusion thereto; or after "the General Thanksgiving;" or after "the Order of Morning or Evening Prayer; or after the second Lesson; or on Sundays immediately before the Sermon; or at some other convenient pause, as they judge most proper. Some read the Churching service from the reading pew; others at the communion table; others church them at home!

The "Churching of Women" seems to me to take its place most suitably with the other "Thanksgivings upon several occasions," or before "the General Thanksgiving," but is not to be alluded to therein. The minister should continue in his reading pew, the woman "kneeling down in some convenient place," such "as hath been accustomed," or "as the Ordinary," if there be cause for consulting him, "shall direct."

[It may be excusable in me to refer to an irregularity in this place, for which the English Prayer Book affords no opportunity, though it is very common in our country. I refer to the introduction of the Occasional Prayers: some introduce them *before* the General Thanksgiving in the Morning and Evening Service, and others *afterwards*. The Rubric directs their introduction "*before the two final prayers.*" The diversity

has arisen from the fact, that some consider the Apostolic Benediction as one of the "two final prayers," and others do not so consider it.

I think it sufficient to decide this matter, to say that the Rubric is copied from the English Prayer Book, in which the General Thanksgiving is one of the Occasional Prayers, instead of part of the regular order of Morning and Evening Service.

In that Book, moreover, in the Rubric before the Prayer for the Queen's Majesty, five prayers are mentioned as following: here the Apostolic Benediction *must be* included to make up the number. It also speaks of the two final prayers being used after the Litany. Here the Apostolic Benediction is again included. In that Book, therefore, the General Thanksgiving cannot be one of "the two final prayers" intended; and, consequently, the Apostolic Benediction must be reckoned as one of them. And if it was so considered in the English Rubric, it is undoubtedly so considered in ours, which is, in this respect, the same as the English. If this be admitted as a correct view, (and I conceive there can be no reasonable doubt about it,) then it settles the matter, that by the "two final prayers," we are to understand the Prayer of St. Chrysostom, and the Apostolic Benedic tion; and, therefore, the Occasional Prayers must be used *after*, and not *before*, the General Thanksgiving.]

We are thus arrived at the end of the Litany, after which, in places where they sing, singing is usually introduced. The

mode of conducting it presents us with two or three notes of discrepancy.

34. Some ministers confine it to the authorized versions of the psalms, and to hymns appended by authority to those versions: others make use of unauthorized versions and hymns.

At the end of the Litany, singing is useful, unobjectionable, and good: provided it be not allowed as a substitute for the Church's provision after the third Collect; and provided also it be restricted to authorized compositions. Unauthorized psalmody and hymns are a violation of the Church's principles of public worship, and abundant in manifold evil, as I once showed in a pamphlet of "Thoughts" on that subject, published by Messrs. Rivington, London.

[The Church in this country has required, by a Rubric at the end of the hymns, that, "Whenever the hymns are used at the celebration of Divine Service, a certain portion or portions of the psalms of David in metre, shall also be sung." The psalm is usually sung at the end of the Litany, or Morning Prayer, before the Ante-Communion Service, and also after the Evening Prayer, before the Sermon. The hymn is usually sung after the Ante-Communion Service,

and before the Sermon, in the morning; and after the Sermon in the evening, before proceeding to the concluding Post-Communion Service. The usage in regard to this is neither uniform or obligatory.]

35. In the announcement of what is to be sung, some ministers "proclaim" it themselves: others employ the parish clerk or other delegate.

It is the order of the Church, that "nothing be proclaimed or published in the church, during the time of divine service, but by the minister." Therefore the singing of a psalm should be proclaimed, not by the parish clerk, or any other person, but the clergyman.

36. In the form of announcement, reference sometimes is made only to the psalm and verses to be sung, and perhaps to the page of a particular selection: in other cases the congregation is exhorted to "sing to the praise and glory of God," and reminded that in so singing it behoves them to "stand up."

There is a decency and propriety in calling upon the congregation to "sing to the praise and glory of God:" and it is well to

remind them of the fit posture for that act of devotion. I know of no more suitable form of announcement than this: "Let us stand up, and sing to the praise and glory of God such a psalm, such and such verses."

37. Some ministers always terminate the singing with the doxology: others only occasionally, if at all.

The use of the doxology, on all occasions, is most agreeable to the mind of the Church, who, with respect to our prose version, directs, that "at the end of every psalm, and of every part of the 119th psalm, shall be repeated" the Hymn of Glory.

[The spirit of this direction of the Church, as well as the reasons on which it is based, if not the letter of the direction itself, certainly requires the doxology after every psalm and hymn in metre, as well as after each of the psalms or portions of psalms in the Psalter, and the prose chants.

Before proceeding to consider the remarks upon the distinct parts of the Communion Service, it may be well to insert one or two other matters which seem to be called for in this connection.

1. In the first place, I refer to the omission of the Ante-Communion Service on Sundays and other Holy Days, for which a Collect, Epistle, and Gospel are

provided. This is entirely without authority, and unjustifiable.—*See below p.* 160.

The House of Bishops have been requested to express their opinion as to the obligation to use this service on all Sundays and other Holy Days. This they have refused to do in express form, on the ground, as I have been told by one who is now of their number, that they would not allow its obligation to be so far called in question as would be implied by their passing a resolution upon the subject.

But again. The title prefixed to "the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels to be used throughout the year," is, in itself, a direction that they shall be used on the days thereinafter specified, and for which they are individually named. But no place or provision is made for their use except as they occur in the Ante-Communion Service. If, therefore, they cannot be used without this service, then the direction, or command, to use them, is a direction, or command, to use the Ante-Communion Service also. There may be reasons why no service should be held on the days specified for the use of these Collects, &c., but one can hardly conceive of a reason why the Ante-Communion Service should be omitted, if any service is held at all. I conclude, therefore, that the Ante-Communion Service should be used on all Sundays and other Holy Days, when circumstances will admit of a service. Otherwise, we cannot use the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel which are appointed "to be used."

2. Another point requiring consideration here, as I conceive, is in relation to the place where the Ante-

Communion Service is to be performed. The English Rubric is express, and, therefore, leaves no room for doubt or diversity of practice. "And the priest, standing at the North side of the Table," &c. In the American Prayer Book the Rubric is thus: "And the minister, standing at the right side of the Table, or where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said." It is believed that the expression in the English Service, "*North side*," is equivalent to "*right side*" in the American. No difficulty, therefore, arises out of the ambiguity of this expression. But the difficulty arises from the words introduced in the American Rubric following, viz., "*or* where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said." I confess that I am ignorant of any "*appointment*" that has been made by the Church on this subject. But why was this clause introduced? I can only offer a conjecture in reply; viz., that it was foreseen that this Prayer Book must be used in many places where there was no Table, no provision for administering the Communion; as in school-houses, private dwellings, sectarian conventicles, &c.; and, therefore, this clause was introduced to adapt the service to those cases. Perhaps, with greater means for research than are now at my command, I might find some authority on this subject; but at present I know of none.

A comparison of the English Rubric in this place with the American, has suggested another conjecture, viz., that the words "where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said," have been transposed, with others, so as now to refer to what they

were not at first designed to apply. The English Rubric is as follows: "The Table, at the Communion time, having a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, *where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said.* And the priest, standing at the North side of the Table, shall say," &c. But in our own Rubric, the words in italics, just cited, follow, with a disjunctive conjunction, (as stated above,) the words "standing at the right (North side) of the Table," &c. I am at a loss to account for the appearance of these words in the Rubric at all; for I am confident that the Church has never "*appointed*" a place for the purpose specified. Though we generally have reading desks, yet they are not by her *appointment*. She has made no law upon the subject. The words, therefore, refer to what does not, in point of fact, exist in this country; and describe, as the alternative of reading the Ante-Communion Service at the right side of the Table, a place which can nowhere be found in our churches. It may have the appearance of special pleading, but it is nevertheless true, that, by a strict adherence to the letter of the Rubric as it now stands in our Book, the minister *must* read this part of the service at the right side of the Table, since the other place, "where Morning and Evening Prayer *is appointed* to be said," has no existence, no such appointment having ever been made.

Every principle of liturgical worship requires that the Ante-Communion Service should be said at the North, or right, side of the Altar. The distinction

between the Morning Prayer and the Communion Service is great, and ought to be kept in view. This is best done by saying them from the different places appropriate to each. The Communion Service is peculiarly the service of the Altar, and should be used there only.]

We proceed to the Order for the Holy Communion, at the commencement of which a discrepancy occurs.

38. Some clergymen read the Lord's Prayer here kneeling, others standing; some turning towards the people, others turning to the Lord's table.

39. In some congregations the people repeat the Lord's Prayer with the priest; in others they are silent, adding only the "Amen" to his repetition of it.

Upon the first occurrence of the Lord's Prayer in her service, the Church prescribes, "Then the minister shall kneel, and say the Lord's Prayer with an audible voice; the people also kneeling, and repeating it with him, both here, and wheresoever else it is used in Divine Service." This direction being expressed in universal terms I take to be the rule for the people in that part of Divine Service, which commences the order

of the Holy Communion, notwithstanding the Rubric there gives instructions for the priest only, without specifying the people, otherwise than to say, that, whilst the priest is "standing," the "people are to kneel." He is at first to turn to the Lord's table; and, after the Lord's Prayer and following Collect, to turn to the people.

[The Lord's Prayer may be omitted in this place in the American Church, if it has been said immediately before in the Morning Prayer.]

40. On the rehearsing of the Ten Commandments, the "people's prayer for mercy and grace," at the end of each, is sometimes uttered in the common tone of prayer, and sometimes chanted or sung, in the manner of a cathedral service.

The common tone of prayer is proper for the succeeding prayers "for mercy and grace." They ought not to be chanted, unless in connection with the choral service.

41. After the Commandments, the priest in some congregations, standing as before the delivery of them, directs his face towards the Lord's table; in others he remains with

his face turned to the people; whilst saying one of the Collects for the King or Queen, as well as the Collect for the day: in some places, instead of standing, he kneels.

During the rehearsal of the commandments, the priest is to "turn to the people:" afterwards he is to "stand as before," that is, as before he rehearsed the commandments, or with his face not turned to the people, but to the Lord's Table.

42. In fixing on the Collect for the day, where a Sunday and a Saint's day coincide, the same discrepancy is apt to prevail as at the first Collect for Morning Prayer. But at certain seasons another discrepancy arises: for whereas in Advent some ministers repeat the Collect for the first Sunday with the other Collects, and in Lent the Collect for the first day of Lent, and during the Christmas Holydays the Collect of our Lord's Nativity, after the Collect appointed for the day, this repetition is not made by others, on the recurrence of the first Collect at the Communion.

The same rule, which regulates the first Collect for Morning Prayer, should regulate

that also at the Communion. The Collect of the day should in each case be the same: and if an additional Collect, as in Advent and in Lent, and after Christmas day, follow in the former case, it should follow also in the latter.

43. On the concurrence of a Saint's day with a Sunday, whilst some read both Collects, as before noticed, others read one only, varying however as to the choice of that one, and carrying the same variety into their respective preference of the Epistle and Gospel for the day.

The choice of the Epistle and Gospel, where a Sunday falls in with a Holy Day, should follow that of the Collect.

44. In the introduction of the services of the supernumerary Epiphany Sundays, when necessary before Advent, much discrepancy exists as to the choice of those which had been omitted.

Of the Epiphany Sundays, the latest of the services, which were omitted in their course, should be chosen to supply the want before Advent.

45. After the Collect the priest is to

"read the Epistle, saying, The Epistle [or, The portion of Scripture appointed for the Epistle] is written," &c. Some clergymen use the term "The Epistle," when the extract is made from one of the Apostolical Epistles, and the other term, "The portion of Scripture," &c., when the extract is made from some other book of holy writ: others use the phrase, "The portion of Scripture," indiscriminately, whencesoever the extract be taken.

The phrase, "The Epistle," should be used, when the Epistle, technically so called, is taken from an Apostolical Epistle: when the extract is made from some other book of holy writ, and only then, should be used the phrase, "The portion of Scripture appointed for the Epistle."

46. In specifying the chapter, some clergymen say, "The Epistle is written in such a chapter of *that* to the Romans," or as the case may be: and so of the Gospel, "The holy Gospel is written in such a chapter of *that* according to, or by, St. Matthew," or as the case may be. Others say, "The Epistle is written in such a chapter of St. Paul's

Epistle, or of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle, to the Romans:" and "The holy Gospel is written in such a chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew."

The word "Epistle" in this Rubric, and so likewise the word "Gospel," are each used in two different senses: the one being the technical phrase for that particular portion of the service, the other denoting a book of holy Scripture. In the latter case the use of the pronoun "that" is a confounding of the two senses.

47. In some churches at the reading of the Gospel, the people stand up: in others they do not. And in some places, on the announcement of the Gospel, the people say, "Glory be to thee, O Lord;" in others they do not.

At the reading of the Gospel it is ordered, that "the people shall be all standing up." But for the acclamation of Glory to God, however in itself unexceptionable and becoming, there is no actual authority, it having been omitted, probably by an oversight.

[*This ascription* has been restored in our book.]

48. In saying the Nicene Creed some

ministers turn to the people; others to the Lord's Table.

During the recitation of the Nicene Creed, the minister's proper direction is towards the Lord's Table.

49. The Gospel ended, some clergymen say, "Here endeth the Gospel:" others, without any such words, pass immediately to the Creed following.

"The Gospel ended, shall be sung or said the Creed following." There is no provision for notifying the end of the Gospel, as there is of the Epistle.

[The Creed in this place may be omitted in this country, if "one of them hath been said immediately before in the Morning Service."]

50. After the Creed, the Nicene Creed, some clergymen then declare to the people the Holy Days or Fasting Days, that are to be observed in the week following: some declare the Holy Days only: others make no such declaration. Some also observe these Holy Days, especially such as relate to our blessed Redeemer: others observe them not.

The order for the curate's declaration of the Holy Days and Fasting Days to be observed in the week following is imperative, and is therefore good to be obeyed; it is good also as a permanent testimony to the people of the Church's care for their edification. Where the people cannot be persuaded to observe the other Holy Days, efforts should nevertheless be made for the observance of those which have special reference to our blessed Redeemer; such as, not Christmas day only and Good Friday, but the Circumcision, the Epiphany, the Presentation in the Temple, the Annunciation, and, particularly and most of all, the Ascension. If the Morning Service be impracticable, the day might be fitly marked by an Evening Service.

51. Some clergymen do not permit anything to be proclaimed or published in the church during the time of divine service, but by themselves; nor by themselves anything but what is prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, or enjoined by the King or Queen, or by the Ordinary of the place: others permit notices to be proclaimed by

different persons, and those without either of the forenamed authorities.

Every clergyman is forbidden to allow anything to be proclaimed or published in the church during divine service, except by himself; and anything which is not prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, or by Royal or Episcopal authority.

52. In giving warning of the holy Communion, some say merely, "You are desired to take notice, that on such a day the sacrament of the Lord's Supper will be here administered," without reading any exhortation. Others give such notice before the Sermon, and after the Sermon read the exhortation. Others read the exhortation, without giving any other notice, before the Sermon.

After the Nicence Creed it is directed, that "then shall notice be given of the Communion." But after the Prayer for the Church Militant it is directed, that "when the minister giveth warning for the celebration of the holy Communion, ... after the Sermon or Homily ended he shall read this exhortation following." It is an opinion of

ritualists and commentators, which cannot be fully set forth here, that, by an oversight, these directions do not correctly convey the Church's intentions, which are best fulfilled by the giving of the notice and the reading of the exhortation together, after the Nicene Creed, and before the Sermon.

[In our Church, the notices are to follow immediately after the Gospel.]

53. In exhorting to the holy Communion, by means of the former of the two exhortations, some ministers say the whole, others a part only. In case of their seeing their people negligent to come, some use the latter exhortation, which others do not.

Each of the exhortations relating to the holy Communion, not in part only, but the whole, ought to be read on fit occasions. Happy the minister, who can, consistently with his prescribed duty, forbear all use of the latter!

54. At this period of the service, some clergymen say, "Pray, remember the poor;" and interrupt the service whilst the poor-box is sent round the congregation: others sus-

pend their collection for another opportunity, and then accompany it with a continuance of the divine service.

An interruption of the service after the Nicene Creed, for inviting and collecting alms for the poor, is not agreeable to the provisions of the Church, who directs such collection to be made at another time, when she connects the act of charity with an act of devotion.

55. In some congregations singing is introduced here between the Nicene Creed and the Sermon: in others, directly after the Creed, "then follows the Sermon."

Singing after the Nicene Creed is out of place, and disturbs the appointed order of the service. The Church's direction, "Then shall follow the Sermon," is a plain indication of her mind and will.

[Singing in this place is, however, sanctioned in our Church by general, if not universal, usage.]

56. Previously to the Sermon, in some congregations the minister withdraws from the church to the vestry room, and continues there during the collection and singing:

when, having exchanged his surplice for a black gown, he returns to the congregation, and ascends the Pulpit. In others the minister proceeds at once from the Communion Table to the Pulpit, without any change of dress.

Neither at this, nor at any other, time of the service should the minister separate and absent himself from his congregation. If his withdrawal were necessary, for the purpose of changing his dress, having changed it, he ought to return instantly. But the Church imposes on him no such necessity. She neither enjoins, nor sanctions, nor permits, nor recognizes, a change of dress; but sends him straight, not to the vestry, but to the Pulpit. Nor does she know any thing of a black gown for her officiating ministers. To some minds indeed any change of dress is an innovation, savoring of Rome: the particular change, of Geneva. At all events, neither the one, nor the other, is acknowledged by the Anglican Church. Her prescript dress is the same for all their ministrations.

[There is no more authority for this practice of

changing the surplice for the gown, in this country than in England. It should be considered, however, that we have not (as they have in England) any written law upon this subject, which we can fall back upon as a corrector of irregularities and unseemly usages. The surplice is the ecclesiastical garment. The gown was introduced out of a spirit of opposition to the Church. It was the common every day garment worn at that time by the learned; and was worn into the church, because they would not so far respect the house of God and His service as to make any change in their dress when they engaged in it. If its use in the public services meant any thing besides this, it was that they preached because they were *learned men*, rather than because they were the *ordained ministers of God's Holy Word:* that they came to deliver their own conceits and opinions, supported by the badge of their qualifications for so doing, rather than as the ambassadors of Christ, authorized to deliver His messages to sinful men.]

57. Before the delivery of their text, some clergymen supplicate the divine blessing in a prayer of their own composition, extemporary or otherwise; others in a form taken from the Book of Common Prayer; others again act on the supposition, that an hortatory form, addressed to the people, is more suited to the Pulpit than a prayer addressed immediately to the Deity. Others

deliver their text, and begin the Sermon at once.

Extemporaneous prayer in public worship is altogether repudiated by the Church, and she allows no prayers but those of her own Liturgy. If, therefore, any prayer be used before the Sermon, it should be taken from the Book of Common Prayer. But I can find no authority for any prayer there, and it is my belief that not any is intended by the Church. Her silence indeed seems to be conclusive. The 55th Canon in the English Code, which is the nearest approach to an authority, contains a form, which is however not precatory, but injunctive or monitory: "Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, &c.:" so that this form, whatever may have been, and may be, its authority for the purpose to which it was directed, is in fact no authority for a prayer. If however the popular prepossession should be in favor of a prayer before the Sermon, and the minister should think it desirable to indulge such a prepossession, he might perhaps, I will not say justify, but excuse his indulgence on the plea of long-continued

usage, in a case which he may deem not clearly defined, and where the negative is not secured by an express prohibition. Still I cannot but retain my opinion, that the silence of the Church is very expressive: (for surely, had she intended any prayer to be here introduced, she would have declared her intention, not merely by a general order, but would have moreover ordered what the prayer should be:) and that therefore for the Sermon to follow immediately, without the intervention of a prayer, is the course agreeable to her mind and rule. For the evening, if a Sermon be needed, the same course might be taken as in the morning: the Sermon being followed by the Blessing.

58. After the Sermon, some clergymen, if there be no Communion, continue in the Pulpit, and thence offer a prayer, and let the people depart with a blessing: others "return to the Lord's Table, and begin the Offertory, saying one or more of the following sentences, and cause the alms and other devotions of the people to be received, and humbly present and place them upon the holy Table, and say all that is appointed at

the Communion, until the end of the General Prayer [For the whole state of Christ's Church Militant here on earth], together with one or more of the Post-Communion Collects, concluding with the Blessing" from the Lord's Table.

After the Sermon, "then shall the priest return to the Lord's Table, and begin the Offertory, saying one or more of the sentences following;" during which, "the alms for the poor and other devotions of the people" are to be "collected in a decent bason, and reverently brought to the priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the holy Table." And, "if there be no Communion, shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion, until the end of the General Prayer, *For the whole state of Christ's Church Militant here in earth*, together with one or more of these Collects last rehearsed," those, namely, in the Post-Communion, "concluding with the Blessing." These instructions of the Church are as imperative, as they are unambiguous and easy to be understood. In two respects they leave the minister to his discretion

namely, the "saying of *one* or *more* sentences" at the Offertory, the duration of which will of course be regulated thereby; and the "saying of *one* or *more*" of the Post-Communion Collects. But no discretion is allowed for the minister's use or omission of the Prayer for the Church Militant; nor is there any sanction for his remaining after the Sermon in the Pulpit, and thence delivering a prayer and the Blessing.

[There is here a difference between the English Rubrics and ours. By our Rubric the minister is directed to "return to the Lord's Table and begin the Offertory," only "when there is a Communion." So that, on all Sundays and Holy Days, when there is no Communion, the Ante-Communion Service may be ended with the Sermon; and from the Sermon the minister may go directly to the Post-Communion Service, to wit, the Prayers and Benediction. And even when there is no Sermon "upon Sundays and other Holy Days shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion unto the end of the Gospel, concluding with the Blessing." It is to be understood, however, that the Ante-Communion Service properly ends with the Prayer for the whole State of Christ's Church, and of course, therefore, includes the Offertory. And whenever a collection is taken up, even

if there be no Communion, the minister should return to the Table after the Sermon, and use the remaining part of the Ante-Communion Service, viz., the Offertory, and Prayer for the Church Militant.]

59. In consequence of the Blessing from the Pulpit, in some places non-communicants withdraw after the Sermon, sanctioned therein, as they suppose, by the priest's or bishop's benediction. In others they continue till a later period; for instance, till the conclusion of the "Prayer for the Church Militant."

The sanction which appears to be given, by the delivering of the Blessing from the Pulpit, for the departure of the general congregation after the Sermon, is a strong argument against that practice, besides others which the following Rubrics supply.

60. If there be a Communion, some ministers withdraw again to the vestry room during the departure of the non-communicants; whence again, re-attired in the surplice, they return to the Communion Table, for resuming and continuing the service: others remain all along at the Lord's Table.

If there be a Communion, the minister is to return from the Pulpit to the Lord's Table, and there continue for the discharge of his office. He has no business in the vestry, and he ought to be on his post, waiting on his congregation, lest, by departing from the church, he encourage the departure of the people. For the avoiding of confusion by the withdrawal of non-communicants, and for the "convenient placing of the communicants," a brief pause in the service is necessary; the best place for which in my judgment is the interval between the Prayer for the Church Militant, and the exhortation to the communicants "at the time of the celebration of the Communion."

[The most proper time for dismissing the congregation of non-communicants, seems to be at the close of the Prayer for the Church Militant. And this should not be done by any false or fictitious ending of the service, either with the Apostolic or the Sacerdotal Benediction. They who thus turn their backs upon the Table of the Lord, have no right to, and no share in, the Benedictions of His priests or His Church. The silence of the Church is decisive on the point of any Benediction in this place. Nor is there any au-

thority for giving an invitation here or elsewhere, (except that which follows in the Communion Service) as is sometimes done, to persons not belonging to the parish to remain and communicate. If they are members of the Church, and belong to other parishes, they will need no special invitation, for they will understand their rights and privileges as members of the one Catholic Church. If not, if they are members of "other denominations." it would appear that they have no right to commune at all.

The Rubric at the end of the Order for Confirmation, says expressly, "And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed." This is certainly never the case with members of the other denominations, that may accidentally be present.]

61. Some place the bread and wine upon the holy Table, together with the people's offerings, before the Prayer for the Church Militant: others at some different time.

The "alms and other devotions of the people," as also "the bread and wine," are "to be placed upon the holy Table *then*," when the Church directs, or immediately before the "Prayer for the Church Militant."

62. Whilst the sentences at the Offertory are in reading, some congregations stand and

others sit: and at the exhortation, "Dearly beloved in the Lord," &c., some stand and others kneel.

Standing, not sitting, is the proper posture for the congregation, while the sentences are in reading. Standing, not kneeling, is their proper posture during the exhortation.

[It will be seen by reference to the opinion of the House of Bishops, expressed A. D. 1832, given below, that *sitting* during the Offertory is recognized as the appropriate posture in this country, though Bishop MANT recommends *standing*.]

63. During the order of administration of the Lord's Supper, some priests stand, except on three certain particular occasions, when they kneel: others kneel generally.

The priest is to kneel three times, during the administration: 1, at "the General Confession;" 2, at the prayer "We do not presume," &c.; 3, when he receives the Communion. At all other times he is directed to stand.

64. Some, according to circumstances, turn now to the Lord's Table, now to the people: others turn more generally to the people.

The priest is to turn to the Lord's Table at all times, unless when he speaks to the people, to whom on such occasions he is to turn himself, as the Church severally directs.

65. In delivering the Communion to those who are intending to receive it, some ministers are careful to observe, whether any bishops, priests, and deacons be present, and deliver it to them first; others are apt to deliver it to all communicants indiscriminately.

The Communion is to be delivered to the bishops, priests, and deacons, first, if any be present, and after that to the people. In order to which any clergymen, who may be present, should present themselves at the Lord's Table, so as to enable the officiating minister to discern them, and act according to his instructions.

66. In "receiving the Communion himself," the minister sometimes uses the words which he is directed to use "when he delivereth it to any one" of the communicants; sometimes he accommodates the words, by substituting the first personal pronoun for

the second: and sometimes he receives it in silence.

The words, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, &c.," and "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, &c.," are directed to be said when the minister *delivereth* the bread and wine to each communicant. If they were intended to be said, when the minister *receives* the Communion himself, the Church would most probably have directed it. But she has not done so; nor does the apostrophe of the minister to himself appear to me natural and eligible. In fact she does not direct anything to be said, wherefore to receive in silence is irreprehensible. Yet no one surely can find fault, if the minister give gentle utterance to the prayer of his heart; "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for *me*, preserve my body and soul unto everlasting life."

67. In delivering the bread or the wine to any one, some ministers deliver them to each person severally, using to each the singular pronouns, "thee" and "thy:" others deliver them to two or more persons

collectively, substituting the plural pronouns for the singular, and causing by one act a sevenfold discrepancy.

"When the minister delivereth the Bread to any one, he shall say, 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, &c.'" "And the minister that delivereth the Cup to any one, shall say, 'The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, &c.'" The language of the Rubric is decisive against the practice, derived of late from the Puritans, of a delivery to more than one person at a time; and it is rendered more decisive, if possible, by its history, for which I would refer to the Rev. J. C. Crosthwaite's excellent Tract, "Communio Fidelium."

[The Rubric is different in form, though similar in import, in our Prayer Book, from what it is in the English. By the English Rubric the minister is directed as follows: "When he delivereth the Bread to any one, he shall say, 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life, &c.'" But in our own Rubric the language is not so precise: "When he delivereth the Bread, he shall say, 'The Body,'" &c. The remarks of Bishop Mant, however, are very applicable to our administrations of the Sacrament.]

68. As to the cup, some ministers put into it and distribute wine only: others are understood to "put to the wine a little pure and clean water."

The Church gives no countenance to the mixing of water with the sacramental wine. Her authority for so doing, in King Edward VI.'s first book, was subsequently withholden, and has not been revived. To revive it now were a dangerous, and offensive, innovation.

69. After the Communion, some ministers introduce a psalm or a hymn, such as the Church does not recognize for the occasion: others are content with the Hymn of Glory, which the Church appoints to be "then said or sung."

The Hymn of Glory, appointed by the Church, is the only authorized, and, therefore, the only fit, composition to be sung after the Communion.

70. At this hymn, the "Glory be to God on high," &c., some congregations stand, others continue kneeling.

The character and contents of the hymn denote the posture of standing to be fit when it is either said or sung.

[Having now completed Bishop MANT'S remarks upon these discrepancies in the use of the Common Prayer, it may add to the usefulness of this book, for the American Churchman, to subjoin the directions of the House of Bishops, adopted in 1832.

"The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies having, at the last Convention, requested the House of Bishops to express their opinion as to the proper postures to be used in the Communion office, with a view of effecting uniformity in that respect, during its celebration, and the request having been then ordered to lie on the table for future consideration, the House of Bishops now communicated to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies the opinion thus requested of them, as follows:

"1st. With regard to the officiating priest, they are of opinion, that, as the Holy Communion is of a spiritually sacrificial character, the standing posture should be observed by him, wherever that of kneeling is not expressly prescribed, to wit: in all parts, including the Ante-Communion and Post-Communion except the Confession, and the prayer immediately preceding the Prayer of Consecration.

"2d. With regard to the people, the bishops are of the opinion that they should observe the kneeling posture during all the prayers, and other acts of devotion, except the *Gloria in Excelsis*, when standing is required by the Rubric, and except, also, during the allowed portion of the hymns in metre, when the analogy of our services requires the same posture. The same analogy, as well as fitness of posture for

the succeeding private devotions, which are required alike by propriety and godly custom, supposes *kneeling* as the posture in which to receive the final Blessing.

"Analogy, also, and the expression at the close of the shorter exhortation immediately preceding the Confession, as well as the Rubric before the Confession, which supposes the posture of kneeling to be *there* assumed, indicate that that exhortation, and the longer one immediately preceding, should be heard by the people *standing*. The postures, therefore, proper to be observed by the people, during the Communion office, the bishops believe to be as follows:

"*Kneeling* during the whole of the Ante-Communion, except the Epistle, which is to be heard in the usual posture for hearing the Scriptures, and the Gospel, which is ordered to be heard *standing*.

"The sentences of the Offertory to be heard *sitting*, as the most favorable posture for handing alms, &c., to the person collecting.

"*Kneeling* to be observed during the Prayer for the Church Militant.

"*Standing* during the exhortations.

"*Kneeling* to be then resumed, and continued until after the Prayer of Consecration.

"*Standing* at the singing of the hymn.

"*Kneeling* when receiving the elements, and during the Post-Communion, or that part of the service which succeeds the delivering and receiving of the elements, except the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which is to be

said or sung *standing*. After which the congregation should again *kneel* to receive the Blessing.

"The House of Bishops are gratified at the opportunity afforded them by the above noticed request of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, of contributing to what they hope will be perfect uniformity in all our churches in the matter now before them.

"The foregoing document was ordered to be printed and distributed."]

II. I have thus proceeded, Rev. and Dear Sir, step by step over the ground of my enumeration, and have stated my sentiments on the proposed questions with as much brevity, precision, and perspicuity as I can command. As they are all cases, wherein a discrepancy avowedly exists, it is impossible but that in every case an opinion must be unfavorable to one side or the other. I trust, however, that in no case will my opinion appear to have been given in a controversial or censorious spirit, or otherwise than with the moderation and courtesy of a Christian minister.

I trust, also, that I shall not appear to have written in a spirit of innovation, however desirous I may have shown myself to

assist in reviving and re-establishing amongst us a more strict obedience to the laws of the Church. On the contrary, every opinion which I have given is directed to the better observance of some law, actually existing, and to which our conformity is engaged, however it may have been unheeded or neglected. But upon this point a clear apprehension of our real situation, detached from erroneous representations, is much to be desired: and I purpose, therefore, Rev. and Dear Sir, before I conclude this letter, to add a few words with reference to objections, which you may have sometimes heard against a strict celebration of our liturgical services.

1. Such a celebration you have no doubt sometimes heard reprobated as an *innovation*. But to "innovate" I take to be, as defined by our great lexicographer, to "bring in something not known before," "to change by introducing novelties:" now, contrary to this, the proposed object is to renew; to "restore" our old and duly established rites, which have been superseded by novelties, to

their former state, their ancient legitimate position: not to "innovate" in a word, but to "renovate." This was the principle of our Reformation. We had erred from the primitive Church in our religious rites and ceremonies: and so it was the aim and endeavor of our spiritual fathers, the regenerators of our National Church, to bring us back to the observance of God's law in our public worship. And in pursuance of that principle, so far as we have erred from the rule of our reformed Church, reformed as she was after the model of the primitive, we would fain return from our error, and proceed in the right way. If between the times of our Reformers and our own, any intermediate generations have arisen, less vigilant in their adherence to our Ritual as established in our Book of Common Prayer, it is the part of the present generation, not to acquiesce in an irregular precedent, upon the fact being made clear to our apprehensions, but to correct, amend, and renovate by our future care what has been innovated by their oversight. Surely innovation is strangely charged on those who, renouncing

the novelties which have crept in since the eras of the Reformation, of the Restoration, of the Revolution, yea within our own memories, "stand in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way" of our first protestant forefathers, that we may "walk therein."

2. But this right way, as by some it is esteemed, is by others accounted *obsolete*. Yet, however it may have been for a time overlooked, neglected, and partly disused, "unfashionable," as Dr. Johnson explains the term, it is not therefore, nor has it been "worn out of use," and fit to be abandoned. It is plain before us: it is clear to be discerned: it is obvious to be re-entered upon and followed. So long as the Act of Uniformity shall retain its place in the Statute Book, and the Liturgy shall continue to be the Church's legally constituted Book of Common Prayer; so long as it shall be sent forth year after year continually to the members of the Church with the stamp of lawful authority for their use of it; so long as the Church's representative, when he ordains men to her ministry, shall be authorized to

demand of them, in the name of God and of his Church, touching their faithful diligence in ministering the sacraments and discipline of Christ, according to her ordinances; and the men to be ordained shall plight their faith, that by God's help they will so minister them: so long as every minister shall be lawfully required to make, and shall make, solemn declaration of assent and consent to every thing contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and to pledge himself to the use of the prescript form of divine worship in the Church, that and no other: so long it will be preposterous to allow any part of that Book to be *obsolete*; so long shall we be warranted in affirming, that, however it may have been partially, temporarily, locally, slighted and out of fashion, it is in no part "worn out of use," it has in no part forfeited its original claim on the reverential and dutiful observance of the Church's ministers and children: so long should we be resolute and steadfast in maintaining our persuasion, that every portion of the Liturgy is to be rightfully regarded as a living, an integral, a perpetual, and an inalienable member of that

invaluable Book. The truth is that much confusion prevails in some men's minds, as to the sense of these objections; and aid may be given towards the clearing up of that confusion, by a few words of exemplification and contrast. Thus, trine immersion, and certain other Romish usages, such as exorcism, chrism, and the like in holy Baptism; the mixing of a little pure water with the wine in the holy Communion; the frequent crossings, sprinklings, and gesticulations in other parts of divine worship; are *really obsolete* in our Church. Thus, again, the change of language in the Church's baptismal services; the delivery of the bread and wine to more than one communicant at the same time in the holy Communion; the adoption of unauthorized prayers, psalms, or hymns; and the neglect of some congregations to take part audibly in those portions of the service assigned to the people; each of these is *really an innovation*. Thus, again, to pray for the dead is *both obsolete*, and would be to *innovate* on the Church's provisions. But it is neither the one nor the other, to minister the sacraments and other

ordinances of the Church with their ritual and ceremonial accompaniments, and to "pray for the whole State of Christ's Church militant here in earth" in our Sunday and Holyday assemblies, as the law hath perpetually exacted; simply because the law hath perpetually exacted them, and hath never sanctioned their pretermission, however this or that may have been pretermitted without the law's sanction, by individuals, at certain times, and in certain places, through inattention to its authority, and to their own stipulations.

3. Again, a strict conformity to the Church's provisions is by some condemned as *Popish* and *superstitious*, from a vague and vain suspicion of uncertain evil: an insubstantial and indefinite spectre of the imagination, under some terrific, mysterious, and inexplicable name, rather than an ascertained reality, tangible and well-defined. But on a general view it is unreasonable to suppose, that fidelity to the course, which the Church has laid down and circumscribed with the very aim and end of marking, declaring, and securing her distinction and se

verance from Rome, is in effect transformed into a mean and sign of approximation. And with respect to any special accusation, the proper answer is a careful examination of the particular observance which may be the subject of it. If it be found to contain any admixture of Romish leaven, let it be denounced and avoided as a fond superstition. But its very profession of conformity to the Church's laws is a strong presumption, and the fact of its conformity, when proved, is unambiguous testimony, of its purity from Romish corruption: a testimony, which no conscientious member of the Church will venture to impugn.

4. Another objection has been conceived against the observance of certain of our liturgical provisions, as having an *evil tendency*, supposed to be exemplified in the conduct of some prominent ministers of the Church; who, having borne office for some time in her pure communion and ministry, have diverged at length into the extravagances of an alien body. Is there then any natural attraction between the simple, chaste, primitive, and scriptural rites of the Anglican

Church, and the complicated, corrupt, traditionary, and medi-æval inventions of the Church of Rome? True indeed it is, and sad as it is true, that some of those who once professed devotion to their holy Mother in the integrity and fulness of her liturgical peculiarities, have since turned their backs upon her profession of the right Catholic faith: this, however, has been done, not in pursuance, but in despite, of her ritual: and it is no less true, (and God be praised!) that the same holy Mother has numbered, and still numbers, among her sons no more devoted or faithful scions of herself and of the Universal Church, than those who study to "do all things in a seemly and due order," according to her Book of Common Prayer. So far indeed is there just cause for apprehending danger to pure and undefiled religion from strict attachment to the Church's ordinances, that I perceive therein the surest safeguard, under God's blessing, against the corruptions of Rome, as well as against the fanaticism of Protestant sects.

5. Another objection has been framed upon the character of the things themselves,

in respect of their proper importance. One in particular, which has been of late much under discussion, has been accounted *trifling* and *frivolous*; whence has been inferred the needlessness of observing it. And a few of those in the foregoing enumeration may be admitted to be of themselves unimportant. But the inference is altogether beside the mark: for the question is, not what is abstractedly the quality of the things, but what is the authority whereon they stand, and whether they stand on the authority of the Church, who, within the limits of "God's word written," "hath power to decree rites or ceremonies." Indifferent by their own nature, things become important and obligatory, by virtue of the authority that decrees them. Thus they lose their natural character, and demand observance for the law's and for conscience' sake.

6. Of some directions of the Church it has been alleged, that they are *impracticable*: if they be really so, no one can be bound to the performance of them. But impracticability is very different from disinclination, or recklessness, or laxity, or in-

convenience, or self-indulgence: and in our estimation of duty, these latter qualities should be watchfully distinguished from the former. Circumstances also may change incapacity into power. A thing which may be incapable of being done at one time, or in one place, or under other certain circumstances, may be readily done under altered circumstances: and in such case the plea of impracticability is controverted and annulled.

7. It will be alleged, perhaps, as another objection to strict liturgical conformity, that it is disagreeable to the laity of the Church, and is encountered by their opposition. But, although scattered and partial instances of this may have appeared, I am not prepared to admit it as a general position: on the contrary, I think too well of the sober-mindedness, good sense, and religious moderation of my lay brethren, to believe in an extended or enduring opposition to conscientious clergymen, faithfully discharging their appointed and bounden duty in obedience to constituted authority. Opposition, if it ever exist, will, I am persuaded, ere

long give way in reasonable Christian men, before the patient instruction, the mild expostulation, the affectionate admonition, of the accredited "servant of the Lord." As to others, greatly as it is to be desired for all men to be satisfied about the due performance of the Church's services, yet I do not find what authority is committed to the laity, or what obligation is imposed upon them, for regulating divine worship and controlling their clergyman, and absolving him from his ordination vows. On the contrary, the clergyman is authorized and has promised, not only to minister the rites of the Church according to her ordinances, but to "teach the people, committed to his cure and charge, with all diligence to keep and observe the same:" whilst it is the layman's duty, (what I say plainly I trust that I may say inoffensively,) it is, I say, part of the layman's "duty to his neighbor," as the Church teaches him, "to submit himself to his spiritual pastors;" or, in words of still more sacred obligation, to "obey them that have the rule over him, and submit himself," and to "hold such in estimation."

8. By way of a practical objection to liturgical uniformity it has been contended, that such uniformity ought to be not partial but universal; that not some only, but all of the rubrics should be complied with. I warmly commend, and cheerfully concur in, the suggestion: it is indeed to an exemplification of this rule in one of the principal departments of our service, that these letters have been devoted. Here and there, perhaps, a difficulty may be experienced in applying it. But it is much to be remarked, and I beg you, Rev. and Dear Sir, to be particular in remarking, with how great facility and satisfaction any clergyman, who shall go fairly to work, will be able to rectify any deviation, into which he may have been betrayed, and to conform his ministrations to the Common Prayer Book.

9. But some directions of the Church are *doubtful*, and *different interpretations* are entertained concerning them, so that hence arises another objection to the attainment of uniformity in our celebration of divine worship, in pursuance of our liturgical provisions. To this, however, an answer

and a remedy, as there has been already occasion to notice, are provided by the Church's reference to the bishop of the diocese, "who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of all diversity, and the resolution of all doubts: so that the same order be not contrary to any thing contained in this book:" a condition this, which, whilst the power of decision is lodged with the Diocesan, precludes him from deciding, as other provisions preclude the officiating clergy and people from acting, in any manner contrary to the Liturgy of the Church.

Thus, Rev. and Dear Sir, we are brought again to our principle of perpetual Liturgical Conformity. This principle has been cherished neither recently nor vaguely in my predilection for it, and has been used with no hesitating, ambiguous, or fluctuating application. From the commencement of my episcopate I placed it with God's blessing distinctly before my clerical brethren, as you may see in a charge to the clergy of Killaloe in 1822, which I caused to be distributed the following year to the clergy of Down

and Connor: and among the latest acts of my official function has been the maintenance of the same principle in charges delivered to the clergy of Down and Connor and of Dromore in 1842 and 1843, with which I presume you to be acquainted. In the interval special occasions have occurred for impressing upon individual clergymen the same principle in its application to particular duties. On my first connection, above twenty years ago, with the parish, in which I have since resided, my opinion was asked about introducing the reading of the then unaccustomed Prayer for the Church Militant, when there was no Communion, and in consequence of my statement of the law it has been read continually in that church, thenceforth to the present day. About and after that time, instructions were sought by many of the clergy concerning the mode of administering holy Baptism: my answer was a reference to the directions of the Church; and public Baptism, with its liturgical adjuncts, from having been previously disused, and, as some may have supposed, obsolete, has been re-

established, and has maintained its position in many, if not all, of our congregations. On a particular occasion a complaint was laid before me, that in a certain church of the diocese the holy Communion was delivered not severally to each communicant: and I interposed the Church's direction and claim upon the clergyman for a more legitimate ministration. To a question from a clergyman, or rather from several, who felt the inconvenience of changing and resuming their dress during divine service, and who therefore inquired whether they might preach in their surplices, my answer was that they might, for on investigation the surplice appeared to me the prescribed habit of the Church. Later inquiries have been made of me concerning psalmody, and its proper periods, and the use of a prayer in the pulpit before the sermon: and my answer has been given, to the best of my judgment, on the same principle of a reference to the mind and law of the Church, upon these, as upon other occasions, when parties have resorted to me for the resolution of their doubts, and for the appeasing of diversity.

What I thus indicate as the fit course for others, it is by God's help my wish and endeavor to follow in my own practice: and one instance in particular, of my having remodelled my conduct accordingly, may have fallen, Rev. and Dear Sir, under your observation. When I first became a bishop, it was my general practice at Confirmations, to "lay my hand severally on the head" of every candidate, and to pronounce over every one the prescribed form of words in the singular number. This I always did when the number fell within a convenient limit. But in cases of a large number being to be confirmed, I indulged myself so far as to officiate upon two candidates together. After a time, however, I was dissatisfied with what I judged to be irregular: and for some years past I have "laid my hand upon the head," and invoked God's "heavenly grace" in behalf "of every one severally." If there be any persons, as I have reason to think there are, who suppose, that my example in this Office of the Church, is at variance with my admonitions to my clergy, they will be set right by the few words,

which for that purpose I have made bold to introduce upon this occasion.

My sentiments have been now sufficiently unfolded. Apart from all temporary agitation, I am solicitous to promote a great permanent good. The absence of Uniformity in our public celebration of divine worship, I deplore, and have long deplored, as a grievous bane and stigma of the Church. To contribute whatever by God's blessing I may be able towards the mitigation of the evil, especially among the clergy and people of my own diocese, I hold to be my duty in the office which has been committed to me in God's Church: and in the earnest hope, that my humble attempt may be not altogether unfruitful, I pray, and I entreat you to pray, for his blessing upon it, so far as it shall be calculated to promote his honor, and be found agreeable to his word and will.

III. I have led you, Rev. and Dear Sir, through the Church's Morning Service and Communion, specifying sundry examples of ministerial discrepancy, of which, though perhaps here and there one may not exist

in this diocese, yet all will be found in different parts of our Anglo-Hibernian Church. The statement is more prolix than I intended, for the number of seventy has exceeded my anticipation. Others may possibly occur to your own observation: but enough will have been specified for giving some notion of the extent of the discrepancy. I proceed therefore to exhibit its character and consequences. And in so doing I trust and pray that my remarks may be not displeasing to you, Rev. and Dear Sir, or to any other of our brethren, the parochial clergy of the diocese, to whom this letter is designed to be sent. As I shall studiously abstain from all personal reflections, so I would fain hope to avoid all personal offence, however my sense of duty may constrain me to write upon the matter "with sincerity and godly simplicity," thus "speaking the truth from my heart."

1. Ministerial discrepancy subverts the principle of uniformity which is the avowed object of the Church, and defeats her provisions for attaining it. I wish to be as brief as possible, and therefore merely refer you

to the "Acts for the uniformity of common" or "public prayers, and administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church."

2. It controverts her judgment of the value of Uniformity; forasmuch as she, in accordance with the judgment of our temporal rulers, declares, that "nothing conduceth more to the settling of the nation, (which is desired of all good men,) nor to the honor of our religion, and the propagation thereof, than an universal agreement in the public worship of Almighty God."

3. It violates the discipline of the Church: for she strictly enjoins, concerning "the prescript form of divine service contained in the Book of Common Prayer," that "That Form of Liturgy or divine service, and no other, shall be used in any Church of this Realm" (of Ireland and the same of England,) "but that which is established by the law, and comprised in the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments."

4. It is a substitution of private opinion for public authority; and, if we will heed the Church's judgment on the subject, it is,

as such, a religious offence: for as she pronounces in her Preface "Of Ceremonies," "Although the keeping or omitting of a ceremony, in itself considered, is but a small thing; yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God. 'Let all things be done among you,' saith St. Paul, 'in a seemly and due order;' The appointment of which order pertaineth not to private men; therefore no man ought to take in hand, nor presume to appoint or alter any public or common Order in Christ's Church, except he be lawfully called and authorized thereunto."

5. Forasmuch as it thus interferes with "a decent order in the Church," it is injurious to her people's "edification," which is promoted by such decent Order, and "whereunto," in the language of the Church, "all things done in the Church (as the Apostle teacheth,) ought to be referred."

6. To the Rulers of the Church it is an occasion of solicitude and embarrassment: for it places them in the dilemma, of either

apparently assenting to and sanctioning, or at least of acquiescing in and conniving at, irregularities within their dioceses; or of incurring ill-will and obloquy by interposing and endeavoring to correct them.

7. With the clergy in general it is a derangement of that harmony of sentiment and feeling, a confusion of that singleness of mind and unity of action, which becomes Christian men and ministers, pledged to pursue the same holy objects by the same definite means: and it creates a jealousy of each other, and introduces opposition to each other, amongst those, who of all men the most ought to dwell together in unity, and to walk in the house of God as friends: whilst to the younger clergy in particular it is a stumbling block and a snare at their initiation into their professional engagements.

8. It perplexes the laity, when they see the ministers of the Church varying one with another in their ministrations: it occasions them to make invidious comparisons, and to admit partial preferences, probably not always on the best grounds: it tends to diminish in their minds respect for the min-

isterial character, to impeach the dignity of the Church, to abate their confidence in her authority, and to weaken their attachment to her provisions.

9. It gives occasion to the Church's enemies to blaspheme, when they perceive the variations between her theory and her practice: how objections, on which they build their separation from her communion, are patronized and adopted in her services; how discrepant are her ministers and people in offering her appointed sacrifices of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving, in her houses of God, at her Fonts, and at her holy Tables.

10. Lastly, this discrepancy appears to be not agreeable to the will, nor conducive to the honor, of God in our Lord Jesus Christ: for it is his pleasure that "with one mind and one mouth we glorify Him," and that "there be no schism in the body;" and he is announced to us as "the Author, not of confusion, but of peace, as in all Churches of the Saints."

IV. 1. Now admitting this to be a just view, even though it were in only a limited

degree, of our liturgical discrepancies, I venture to anticipate, Rev. and Dear Sir, your concurrence in my opinion, that these discrepancies are an evil, to which it is desirable that a remedy be applied: and further to anticipate your co-operation in applying a remedy, by endeavoring to get rid of the discrepancies within our own sphere of action, and to establish amongst us harmony and uniformity of ministerial practice: for surely it cannot behove Christian clergymen, however we may have been previously inadvertent and negligent; yet, when we are become cognizant of such things, it surely cannot behove us then contentedly to acquiesce in, or rather to be agents in keeping up, a state so pregnant with religious evil, if it be by God's blessing in our power to counteract and correct it.

2. One remedy then there appears to be, and, so far as I can see, there is only one, for the existing evil. And that remedy is a full determination on our parts, one and all, to follow faithfully the guidance of the Church, unless obstructed by some insuperable impediment; to observe her ordinances,

to keep close to her provisions, to submit to her rules, in the administration of the Sacraments and of all other rites and ceremonies of the Church.

3. I forbear to enlarge at present upon this obligation as bound upon us generally, by statute and canon, by public authority and private undertaking, by the voluntary stipulation of the ordination vow and by subsequent subscriptions, oaths, and declarations, on the strength of which we have been admitted to our several stations of ecclesiastical emolument or dignity, of trust and responsibility, in our profession.

4. But looking on this obligation in the particular point of view, wherein the present case offers it to our contemplation, I would earnestly pray you to consider, whether both reason and religion do not indicate this course. On examining the instances of discrepancy which have been now submitted to you, you will find, Rev. and Dear Sir, that they are caused, for the most part, if not altogether, by the conflict between an adherence and a disregard to the Church's rules and provisions. If then a remedy is

to be applied, and harmony is to be substituted for disagreement, is it more conformable to the dictates of true wisdom, is it more in compliance with a conscientious sense of Christian duty, that he, who has heretofore adhered to the law, should now renounce it; or that he, who has deviated from it, should now return into the right path? A well-regulated, sober mind can hardly hesitate in answering such a question. Such at least is my own persuasion. Nay, so far as any one may presume upon his own sentiments and behavior in a supposed case, I am bold to say, that if, as a parochial clergyman, I had incautiously mistaken my course of duty, I should willingly and gladly, and with hearty thanks to Almighty God, embrace a favorable opportunity for rectifying the error, and adopting a stricter line of obedience.

5. But this supposes that the laws of the Church in this behalf are plain and intelligible, as indeed they generally are. Let us, however, allow an occasional obscurity, and what is then to be done with our proposed remedy? The Church herself is sensible of

the possibility of such a case: for she alleges in her preface "concerning the service of the Church," that "nothing can be so plainly set forth, but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same." But then she meets the difficulty by ordaining, that "forasmuch as such doubts may arise, to appease all such diversity (if any arise) and for the resolution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute, the things contained in this Book," namely, the Book of Common Prayer; "the parties that so doubt, or diversely take any thing, shall alway resort," (the phrase is imperative) they "*shall* alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to any thing contained in this Book. And if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop."

6. In clear cases then the plain self-evident rules of the Church, in doubtful or controverted cases the rules of the Church, as interpreted by the Bishop of the Diocese,

or, if he be in doubt, then as interpreted by the Archbishop of the Province, are the authorized guide of a clergyman's ministrations, as generally, so especially and explicitly for the avoiding of all diversity and discrepancy, and for the maintenance of agreement and conformity in holy things.

7. One recommendation, however, I am desirous of adding concerning the most efficient method of carrying the foregoing principle into action. It is my purpose, Rev. Sir, that this letter be sent to you, and to each of our clerical brethren in the diocese, in order that each individual may be invited and enabled to ponder my sentiments with deliberation, and to commune thereupon in the retirement of his secret chamber, with his own heart and with his God. But it is not upon individual, unconnected, insulated exertions that I principally rely for general success. Rather, let several of the clergy, who may be connected together by vicinity of dwelling, or by habits of friendly and social intercourse, or by mutual zeal for the promotion of God's honor in his Church, meet for conference; and, having conse-

crated their meeting by prayer, let them hold sweet counsel together, and come to such a conclusion, as their judgments and their consciences, under a solemn sense of responsibility to God and his Church, shall approve upon this topic of liturgical discrepancy and conformity. In the event, which I anticipate, they will by union strengthen each other's hearts and hands; and they will be placed in a favorable position for repelling specious objections, and for carrying with them the good will and co-operation of the people: for such confidence have I in the sound sense and religious disposition of the laity of the diocese, that I cannot but believe and trust they would cheerfully second the endeavors of their respective ministers for ecclesiastical unity, their minds having been prepared and prompted by their ministers' monitions, and the ministers' endeavors being made by one and all under an avowed conviction of professional obligation, in compliance with their diocesan's "godly admonitions," and in obedience to the authority and laws of the Church.

8. This appears the best, the only, method

for releasing us from the evils of discrepancy in our liturgical services, and for procuring through God's blessing the opposite benefits. Thus may the diocese present the amiable, the venerable, spectacle of "the clergy and people," yea, of "all estates of men" in this department of God's holy Church, and "of every member of the same," striving each in his vocation and ministry to serve God in godliness and truth. Thus may we contribute, in our limited sphere and within our own measure, to promote the prosperity of our national, nay, of the universal Church. Thus our brethren elsewhere may rejoice with us, "joying and beholding our order, and the steadfastness of our faith in Christ," to the glory and praise of God. Thus even gainsayers, seeing how "all things are done among us," as the Church after St. Paul speaketh, "in a seemly and due order," may "have no evil thing to say of us;" and, if they be not persuaded "to fall down and worship God" in our communion, will have cause to "report that God is in us of a truth."

I now commit you, Rev. and Dear Sir,

to the keeping of our gracious God; and pray that he may enlighten our understandings, for discerning and correcting whatever in us may be amiss, and so lead our steps in the way of "quietness, peace, and love." To maintain and set forwards these objects by God's help is part of my consecration vow; and such I believe and mean to be the tendency of this address: for obedience to the Church, next to obedience to God's law, of which indeed it is one essential constituent, is the surest bond of amity, affection, and harmony, amongst her ministers and people. During a professional life of forty-three years, of which twenty-four have been passed in the episcopate, by that principle I have acted myself, and striven to regulate the actions of those committed to my superintendence. And I humbly and heartily thank God, that amid much imperfection, amongst many failures, I have never ceased by his grace to bear in mind the question, which, before my admission to the holy order of priesthood, the bishop demanded of me, in the name of God and his Church, "Will you then give your faithful diligence always

so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the Commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your cure and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same?" and that I have not been willingly unmindful of the solemn words, with which I answered the question, "I will so do, by the help of the Lord."

I remain, Rev. and Dear Sir,

Your faithful friend,

And affectionate brother in Christ,

RD. *Down and Connor*,

and *Dromore*.

ADDITIONS BY THE EDITOR.

The reader will have noticed, that our author has made no attempt to point out the discrepancies and restore uniformity in the use of the other offices in the Book of Common Prayer. It will doubtless be deeply regretted that he has not done it. I shall not attempt to enumerate all the discrepancies in the use of these offices in this country. Some will doubtless censure me for my presumption in attempting to do any thing in regard to them; but, at the urgent solicitation of others, I shall proceed to answer such questions with regard to their use as have been the most frequently proposed to me for answers, by both clergy and laity; and which, therefore, I presume to stand most in need of answers, that there may be uniformity in their use.

The opinions which I shall adventure, are such only as are deducible from the general principles upon which our Rubrics are based. Among these, I will here name only three.

1. That in all cases when the people pray, they shall *kneel*, if the circumstances be such as to conveniently allow of their so doing.

2. That they are to *stand*, whenever the minister is

addressing to them any invitation or exhortation to any act immediately following, and also when they sing.

3. That they may *sit* when they are receiving instruction, whether from the Scriptures being read to them, or from a Sermon; also during the reading of notices.

With these general principles constantly in view, I proceed: and begin with

THE MINISTRATION OF PUBLIC BAPTISM.

As this office is to be used immediately after the second or last Lesson of either the Morning or Evening Service, and *before* the Anthem or Chant, the congregation are in a sitting posture when the parents, sponsors, &c., approach the Font.

When the minister addresses the congregation, "Dearly beloved," &c., they should arise, and stand up until the words "*let us pray*" are said, which are an intimation of the commencement of the Prayer, and of course are a direction to all present to assume the posture of prayer, viz., *kneeling*, if they are in the church, (as is usually the case,) where that can be conveniently done.

I give these opinions on the ground that the congregation are to take part in the services, and that they are not for the minister and sponsors only.

During the reading of the passage from the Gospel, and the "Exhortation" following, the congregation should stand.

This I say, not only on the general ground that the people should rise and stand while the Gospel, *as*

such, is being read, as in the Ante-Communion Service, and likewise while any exhortation by the Church or her minister is being specially addressed to them, as in the commencement of Morning and Evening Prayer, and of the Communion Service proper; but I am also guided in this by the Rubric in this place in the English office—"Then shall the people stand up, and the priest shall say, 'Hear the words of the Gospel,'" &c. Although an English Rubric is no binding authority for us, yet it is a sufficient guide to the general principle applicable to the case, when our own Church has given no direction. We suppose the people to have been kneeling during the Prayer preceding the Gospel; some change of position, therefore, seems requisite at the commencement of the Gospel which they are called upon to "*hear*," whereas at the commencement of the last exercise before they were called upon to "*pray*." I can hardly believe that our Church, by omitting the English Rubric, intended to express a disapprobation of its direction, though I am well aware that such is generally the construction to be put upon all acts of this kind. Unless the congregation should here exhibit the anomaly of sitting during prayer, in which they are called to join, there must be some change of posture at the close of the prayer, when they are called to "*hear*" the Gospel and Exhortation. For the reasons above assigned, therefore, I give my opinion in favor of the standing posture during the Gospel and Exhortation that follows it.

The THANKSGIVING that follows the Exhortation

should be said by the congregation and minister *together*, all *standing*. I give my opinion in favor of this posture for the two reasons, (1) That it will avoid a change in posture, which, in this case, must be considered as unnecessary; and (2) Because standing is the posture generally assumed by our Rubrics as one of joy, &c., as is manifested by directions to assume that posture in singing generally, and especially in the *Te Deum Laudamus*, *Gloria in Excelsis*, *Creed*, &c.

It may not be improper here to cite, for the purpose of calling more special attention to it, the Rubric next preceding the Gospel—"But note, that in every church the intermediate parts of the service," viz., the Gospel, Exhortation, and Thanksgiving, "shall be used once at least in every month, (if there be a baptism,) *for the better instructing of the people in the grounds of Infant Baptism*." I am not the person to address those who neglect the express commands of the Church, any further than merely to call their attention to their duty by pointing out the command. But if there were any thing more that I could with propriety do in this case, I would not fail to do it here.

We now come to that part of the service which is more particularly between the minister and the parents, sponsors, &c., at the Font. It extends through the administration of the Sacrament, and the reception of the child into the congregation of Christ's flock, unto the Exhortation to join in prayers that the child may lead the rest of his life according to that beginning. During the performance of this part the congregation are not, however, regarded in the service

as mere spectators, or witnesses; they should respond to the prayers; and, therefore, in my estimation, they should remain *in the kneeling posture*, from the commencement of the short petitions until the Exhortation after the reception of the child into the congregation of Christ's flock.

The congregation are *not* to respond to the questions which follow the address to the sponsors; but each of the sponsors should respond to them with a clear, distinct, and audible voice. And here we see the impropriety of any persons, presenting themselves as sponsors, who cannot, in their own name and for themselves, as well as in the name of the child and for him, answer these questions from their heart. It is, moreover, impossible that one who cannot thus answer these solemn questions, can fulfill the duties of his office as sponsor, as they are described to him in the Exhortation following the Thanksgiving for the regeneration of the child.

At the prayers which follow the questions, the sponsors should kneel, if that be convenient. If the Font be in the chancel, as it is for the most part in this country, this posture can be easily taken at the chancel rail. They, as well as the rest of the congregation, should not fail to respond to the petitions, by saying the "*Amen*" in its appointed place.

At the PRAYER FOR CONSECRATING the water, which follows the four short petitions that next precede the administration of the Sacrament, the minister should turn himself towards the Font.

When the minister pronounces the words of Bap-

tism, he and the congregation should say the "*Amen*;" it being a general principle in our revised edition of the Common Prayer, (A. D. 1844,) to print the "*Amen*" in the Roman letter only when it is to be pronounced by the minister and congregation together.

As the report of the sub-committee to the joint committee, of 1841, may not be accessible to all my readers, I give the following quotation, from page 12: "It is now pretty generally understood, that where the 'Amen' is printed in Roman character, [Amen] it is to be pronounced by both the officiating clergyman and the congregation. . . . In conformity with this principle, . . . we have placed an 'Amen' in the Roman character at the end of the Confessions, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creeds; as also after the official formulas, the reception of the baptized person into the Church, the one in the Confirmation Service, and those in the Ordination Services." To this list, the standing committee of 1844 added the Thanksgiving in the Baptismal Service

I have also said, in a preceding page, all that can be necessary, in addition to what Bishop Mant there said, of dipping the child, or pouring on the water *three times*. Once, and once only, is the direction of our Church, and more than that cannot be reconciled with her directions.

I would also call attention to another peculiarity of the Rubric. It says nothing of *sprinkling*, but only of "*dipping*," or "*pouring*." Water is used in Baptism as a symbol of cleansing, and for this purpose much, instead of little, is necessary. Beside the fact

that mere sprinkling is not allowed by the Rubric, much of the beauty and significancy of the rite is lost, when the cleansing element is not more plentifully used.

One irregularity more. It is not uncommon for the minister to lay his hand on the head of the child, as he baptizes him, and hold it there, having first sprinkled on the water, while he repeats the baptismal words. This should not be done. It is not *laying on of hands* that is prescribed, (that is done by the bishop in Confirmation,) but it is Baptism simply; and for that, only the dipping of the child, or pouring on of water, is requisite.

Immediately after the Baptism, and before returning the child to the parents, or sponsors, the minister, turning to the congregation, (as if to give notice to them that they may govern themselves accordingly,) should say, "*We receive this child*," &c. And here it is that they come again to be more especially participants in the service. At the close of this reception, both the minister and people should say the "Amen."

After this, the minister is to return the child to the parents, or sponsors, and say to the congregation, "Seeing now, dearly beloved," &c., as an Exhortation to them to join in the Prayers and Thanksgiving following. The people should rise when he commences, and, as the Rubric directs, say the Lord's Prayer with him, and respond "*Amen*" to the Thanksgiving, "*all kneeling*."

The direction in the next Rubric, "all standing up," must be understood, I suppose, as referring to

the whole congregation, although the Exhortation is addressed to the parents and sponsors.

After these remarks upon the form of ministration of Public Baptism for infants, it will be unnecessary to remark upon the other forms for Baptism. I will merely add, that at the baptism of adults, it is most proper, if it be done by pouring or effusion, instead of immersion, that the persons baptized should kneel at the reception of the Sacrament.

Before leaving this subject of Baptism, another matter, which is giving rise to some diversity of practice in our country at present, seems to require attention.

Persons who have had the form of Baptism among the sects of our country, are often seeking admission to the communion of the Church. Sometimes they come with doubts on their mind as to the validity of the Baptism which they have received; sometimes they have so far examined the subject as to be very decided in wishing for Baptism at the hands of one who has "had Episcopal consecration or ordination." Again, the minister himself may have doubts—even if the applicant for admission to communion has none—whether he ought to acknowledge the Baptism of these sects, by receiving the applicant without baptizing him.

Into the general question of the validity of lay Baptism, it would be entirely out of place here to enter. I shall leave the abstract question as unnecessary to be decided in this connection, for the minister is engaged "to conform to the doctrines and worship

of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," and not to his own private opinions; and he is "always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church hath received the same, according to the commandments of God; so that he may teach the people committed to his cure and charge, with all diligence to keep and observe the same." The thing then to be ascertained is, what has the Church directed? and not what are his private opinions; for it is by the former, and not by the latter, that he is to be guided.

The right understanding of the Church's direction upon the subject before us, can be derived only from a historical retrospect of the course of her legislation in regard to it.

The earliest opinion in favor of the validity of lay Baptism on record, I believe, as is conceded by all, is that of TERTULLIAN, A. D. *circ.* 200. The opinion prevailed in the Western Church, and was extensively adopted. In the East, I believe, it was never received. But at the time of the Reformation it was recognized by the churches in the Roman obedience, and Baptism by laymen was directed by Church authority, in certain cases. This opinion prevailed among the early English Reformers. In both the Books of Edward VI., that of 1548, and that of 1552, an office for the private Baptism of infants, to be used "in private houses, in time of necessity," was provided. In this office, "one of them," that is, the people present, is directed to "name the child, and dip him in the water, or pour

water upon him, saying these words, '*N*, I baptize thee,'" &c. And if the child lived he was to be brought into the Church; and the priest was to inquire "by whom the child was baptized? who were present? whether they called upon God for grace and succor? with what the child was baptized? what words were said?" &c.

But at the revision of the Common Prayer, at Hampton Court, after the accession of James I., A. D. 1604, this Rubric before the form of private Baptism was altered. It was then directed that the minister of the parish, "or in his absence any other lawful minister that can be procured," should administer the rite. The child was also to be brought into the Church, and, "if it were baptized by any other lawful minister" than the minister of the parish, he must ask those that bring in the child, as before the alteration, by whom, with what words, and with what element the child was baptized, &c.

Here, then, we have the distinct fact of a designed alteration in the directions of the Church. We may concede (though I much doubt the fact) that the majority of those who made this alteration, held, as their private opinion, to the validity of lay Baptism. The opposite opinion was first introduced into the English Church by those who were Calvinists in their theology. This party had become numerous and powerful before the accession of James; and it was out of regard, or concession, *to them*, that this change in the directions of the Church was made.

Now, this fact is a controlling one, as I regard

it, in fixing the interpretation of this action of the Church; showing as it does most clearly, the *animus* with which it was done. The change was made to gratify the Calvinists, that so the Church might not recognize, or seem to recognize, the validity of lay Baptism. It can hardly be said, I think, consistently with the respect that is due to the dignity of legislation, that the Church in this action only designed to allow of a diversity of opinion and practice on this head. That was not what she *professed* to do, and if it had been what she *designed* to do, the object would have been accomplished in a more unambiguous manner. Besides, her members were before as much at liberty to entertain different private opinions on the subject, as they were afterwards; and there was as much room then for diversity of practice under the Rubric, as there is as it now stands. But neither diversity of opinion or practice was what the Calvinists desired; they wished that the Church should not allow of lay Baptism at all, or express an opinion in favor of its validity. And nothing less than this, therefore, must the action of the Church, under the circumstances, be understood to have accomplished.

It may here be remarked, as a fact which the history of the times renders highly probable, that the majority of the English Church were at this time Calvinistic in their notions, and so could have aimed at nothing less in their alteration than an expression of disbelief in the validity of lay Baptism. This, however, is not material.

But the Church of England, as the Rubric stood

before the alteration just spoken of, did not, even then, recognize such cases as those that come before our clergy at the present day, and declare in favor of their validity. It had no reference to baptisms administered out of the communion of the English Church, and where her forms were not used. If, therefore, the modification of the Rubric, &c., in 1604, did not change the expression of the Church's doctrine concerning the validity of such lay baptisms as might be performed by laymen in her communion, and in the use of her forms, it cannot be claimed that her opinion is expressed in favor of receiving such cases as now come before our clergy. Her opinion was then expressed in favor of one thing; it is now claimed as expressed in favor of another and quite a different thing.

The baptisms that we have now to consider labor under a two-fold disadvantage, so far as admission to the communion of the Church is concerned: (1) They are administered by those whom the Church regards as laymen, out of her communion; and (2) Without the use of her form, or any other form that she can ascertain or rely upon. At present she has no expressed opinion in favor of the validity of lay baptism at all; on the contrary, she has withdrawn the expression of such an opinion, which she had once given.

But we encounter another difficulty, of a serious character, in admitting the lay baptisms of the sects. In all cases of Baptism, the Church requires that the baptized person, either by himself or by his sponsors, shall make some very solemn promises. These pro-

mises are not repeated, but renewed, without repetition, at Confirmation. Now, in point of fact, these promises are not made in the sectarian baptisms. No promises are made, as a general thing; so that such a person, when he comes before the Bishop to be confirmed, *in form* renews "his solemn promise and vow," made at his Baptism; but, *in fact*, renews *nothing*, promises *nothing*. There was nothing to renew.

Or, (to consider the alternative,) suppose there had been promises made, and so something that could be renewed: are they the promises referred to in the Confirmation Service? are they the promises which the Church wishes them to renew? No; for if they promised any thing, it was to receive and believe the Gospel as the sect in which they received their Baptism hold it, that is, to be sectarians and schismatics. Of course, therefore, it was just the promise which the Church does *not* wish them to renew. That promise they must repudiate, in order that they may make or renew those promises which she requires of her members.

But it may be said, that, although the Church has withdrawn the expression of her opinion in favor of the validity of lay Baptism, she has left it an open question. She has expressed no opinion against it.

If this mode of reasoning is good in one case, it must be good in all similar ones.

In the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., the priest was directed to cross himself twice, while saying the Prayer of Consecration in the Communion Service;

to use the trine immersion, the chrism in Baptism, and to annoint the baptized child on the head. But in the second Book of Edward VI., these things were all omitted. Now, I suppose that hardly anybody will say, that this act was not a rejection of those usages by the Church. No one, I presume, would venture to say that the clergy were left at liberty to use them or not, as their private preferences might dictate. If they should be revived, we should, doubtless, have a greater outcry of alarm than we have had in many years past.

Now, the recognition of the validity of lay Baptism stands on precisely the same grounds, as the observance of those usages that we have just mentioned, so far as the present point is concerned.

But again it may be said, that the recognition of the validity of lay Baptism, by the bishops and clergy, even since the alteration was made, must be understood as giving construction to the design of that change.

Where there is any doubt as to the meaning of a law, resulting from the ambiguity of the terms in which it is expressed, the practice that arose under the law by those who had the best opportunity of understanding its provisions, is a good authority for determining its meaning. But no such practice as that now before our minds, arose immediately under this Rubric; for it was not until something more than forty years after the alteration, that the English Parliament, (or rather House of Commons,) passed a law giving validity to Presbyterian ordinations, or that

such ordinations were frequent. Nor was it until *many years* after this act, that the English sects became entirely separate bodies, wholly distinct from the communion of the English Church, so as to present the case of persons who had been baptized in these sects, seeking the communion of the Church.

But this is not all. We must distinguish between a practice rightfully giving construction to a law, and violations of the law which may be winked at and tolerated. For instance, the law of the State of New-York, prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors altogether, was very generally adopted in the spring of A. D. 1846; yet the sale of liquors continued, in almost every town and village throughout the land. Now, it will hardly answer, to say that this practice gave construction to the law, and that we are, therefore, to understand that it did not intend to prohibit the sale of spirits.

The action of the English Church in regard to this matter, must, therefore, under the circumstances, be understood to have been sufficiently explicit. It was at least as much so in this case as in many others, about which no doubt has ever been raised. Nor can any modern practice give a different construction to its meaning. That practice has been by no means uniform, and is of quite too recent a date, to be of much authority for such a purpose.

I think, therefore, that instead of being prohibited from considering such applicants as unbaptized, and admitting them to Baptism before Confirmation and the Eucharist, our clergy are, to say the least, bound

to administer Baptism to all such persons as shall have any doubts in their own minds of the sufficiency of their sectarian Baptism.

In some cases, where persons coming from other denominations have been dissatisfied with the Baptism which they had in their old connection, and have desired that Sacrament from the hands of one who had been episcopally ordained, the minister has used what is called the hypothetical form, provided to be used in case of those infants that have been baptized in private by "some other lawful minister," and the minister of the parish is not satisfied, on inquiry, whether the child has been baptized or not. The form reads, "If thou art not already baptized, I baptize thee," &c.

With regard to this usage, it is to be remarked, that this form was not prepared for such cases as those now before our minds. The doubt referred to by the "*if*," is one which relates to the mode of administering the rite, or to the element, or form of words, with which it is administered. But it has no reference to the authority of the administrator. The Rubric requires that the Baptism shall have been administered by "a lawful minister." It does not contemplate any other case, or prescribe what shall be done in any other case, if one should occur.

It seems to me, therefore, that whenever the administrator uses this hypothetical form, he does it with reference to the doubts in his own private opinion as to the validity of lay Baptism, rather than from any doubt remaining in his mind as to what is the direction

of the Church, after a careful examination of the subject. He has no such doubts as to crossing in the Communion Service, chrism in Baptism, &c., above alluded to, and the direction of the Church is as plain and made precisely in the same way in the one case as in the other.

THE CATECHISM.

My object in alluding to the Catechism is not for the purpose of explaining any doubtful or ambiguous Rubrics, or to attempt to introduce uniformity in the mode or time of catechising. But it is rather to call the attention of the reader to the Rubrics in this connection, that the duty of catechising might not seem to be passed by, as though it were of inferior importance.

The importance of this exercise cannot well be over-estimated. Do what we can to educate our children, and to bring up those of our flocks in the truth, the world will be likely to do much more to educate them for its evil principles and ways. This, however, is not the place to enlarge upon the duty or importance of catechising the children, and other persons, that are candidates for Confirmation.

The first Rubric after the Catechism was changed from the English, doubtless for the purpose of leaving the minister in charge of a parish more to the guidance of his own discretion in regard to the times of catechising. The English Rubric, and still more explicitly the LIX. Canon of that Church, makes it obligatory

upon every parson, vicar, or curate, to catechise the children every Sunday, or Holy Day, after the second Lesson in the Evening Service. Our Rubric seems to require that it shall be done *as often* as is required by the English, though it leaves the minister at liberty to take some other time than Sundays and other Holy Days for it, if he thinks it most expedient to do so.

The Rubric directs, that the catechising shall be done "openly, in the Church." The object of this must be, doubtless, to allow the older members of the congregation to hear the instruction given to the children on these occasions. The accomplishment of this object should, therefore, be a material consideration with the minister, in fixing upon the times for catechising.

The second Rubric relates to the duty of parents and guardians, and is sufficiently explicit in its directions. I shall, therefore, pass it by without further remark.

The third Rubric directs, "So soon as children come to a competent age, and can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and can answer to the other questions of this short Catechism, they shall be brought to the Bishop."

The "competent age" has never been determined upon, so far as I know, by any general rule. In the English Church it is, as I believe, at from twelve to sixteen years. The remarks of WHEATLEY, on the Common Prayer, may be quoted with great propriety in this connection. After alluding to the opinion of some "who would have none admitted to this holy

rite, till such time as they have had an opportunity of giving sufficient testimonies of their faith and desire of living to God by their life and conversation," he says: "But we have already showed that the enabling persons to give such testimonies of their faith and practice, is the end of Confirmation; and, therefore, surely Confirmation is to be administered to assist them in manifesting their faith and practice, and not to be deferred till they are already manifested. For this reason, it is very evidently the design of our Church, that children be confirmed before they have opportunities of being acquainted with sin; that so the Holy Spirit may take early possession of their youthful hearts, and prevent those sins to which, without His assistance, the very tendencies of their age would be apt to expose them. It is indeed highly expedient, that those who are confirmed should be old enough to understand the nature and advantages of the rite they are admitted to, and the obligations it lays upon them, and if they are duly apprized of this, they are deemed by our Church qualified enough. For they that are capable of this knowledge, are yet a years to discern between good and evil; and, therefore, that must be the proper time to secure them, by the invocation of the Spirit, in the paths of virtue."

These remarks deserve the greater consideration, from the fact that they are extracted from a book that is recommended by our House of Bishops, as a text book to be used by theological students, and candidates for holy orders.

There is often a doubt or hesitation in regard to

the qualifications for Confirmation here enumerated. This rite is often regarded as but little else than the public profession of religion, and the enrolment of the name of the individual on the list of regular communicants; and it is, in consequence, thought by many, that it should not be administered until one "has been converted," or "experienced religion," or something of the kind.

Now, it is to be remarked, that these words *often* refer to something which, as Bishop White has said, is foreign to our system, and which he considered as merely an excitement of the "animal sensibility," or purely physical feelings.

One is regenerated in Baptism. Whatever we may think of this doctrine as our private opinion, no man who expects to command or retain a respect for his honesty, should deny that it is the doctrine of our Prayer Book. The candidate, therefore, is not to be presented for Confirmation, until, in the Church's view of the subject, he is regenerate, be the spiritual change implied by that word what it may.

Conversion is a *turning about, or towards*, something, and is necessary as often as one has wandered from the right way of the Lord. But the person who can sincerely answer to the questions in the Catechism and in the Confirmation Service, needs no *turning about*, for he is surely in the right spiritual direction already. Nor, if we believe in human depravity as described in our XXXIX. Articles, (IX. and X.,) can we for a moment doubt, that the heart of any one who can sincerely answer those questions, with a tolerably

good understanding of their import, has been the subject of renewing grace.

One cannot, therefore, be understood as answering the questions in the Catechism, as here intended, until by the aid of divine grace, as well as of human instruction, he is prepared for Confirmation, and the full communion of the Church.

The title of this Catechism, as well as the use which the Church directs to be made of it, place it in a most conspicuous position as the expounder of her view of Christianity and the Christian life. I do not intend to disparage the XXXIX. Articles, but the Catechism alone is that which the Church directs to be taught to all her children and members; and, without repudiating or disparaging any other of her formularies, she does evidently, by her act, declare this to be, in her estimation, the most essential part of all her teachings—the sincere milk of the word. And, therefore, it is by this, rather than by any of her other formularies, as I think, that her doctrinal character is to be judged. This suggestion may have its value in showing still farther the importance of catechising.

THE ORDER OF CONFIRMATION.

In regard to the Rubrics in this service, there is but little to be said. The first Rubric directs, that "on the day appointed, all that are to be confirmed" are to be placed in order, *standing* before the Bishop, when he, or some other minister appointed by him, reads *the Preface.*

Here we are to note, that, although it is called a Preface, and not an Exhortation, yet, as in all cases when Exhortations are read, the congregation are to rise, and remain in the usual posture for hearing Exhortations which, as is universally practiced, is the *standing posture*. Until the last review of the English Prayer Book, A. D. 1661, this Preface was only a Rubric.

To the question of the bishop, it is obvious, from the nature of the case, that the candidates for Confirmation alone are to answer.

In regard to the versicles and responses, which (following the authority of WHEATLEY) I shall consider as designed to be not merely between the bishop and the candidates, but between the bishop and the congregation; therefore, the congregation are to respond audibly in a *standing posture*.

At the words "*Let us pray*," by the Bishop, the congregation and candidates should assume the usual posture for prayer, viz., *kneeling*.

I am now authorized to say, that both the people and the bishop should repeat the "Amen," after the words of Consecration. It was to indicate this, that the word was printed in Roman letters in the standard edition of 1844. I have already quoted the report of the joint committee of the General Convention of 1841, explaining their principles on this subject. And these principles, by the adoption of the General Convention in 1844, have now become an authority for our guidance.

The authority just cited, by directing the people

to respond, repeating the "Amen" after the words of Confirmation to be used by the bishop, has plainly indicated the *kneeling* posture, to be observed by the congregation as well as the candidates, during the administration of the rite. This is certainly the most reverent and devout posture to be observed, both here and during the administration of Baptism also.

It is sometimes thought that the direction, "*all kneeling down*," in the Rubric, immediately after the administration of the rite, implies a change in the posture then to be made, and, by consequence, that the congregation should not have been kneeling before. One indubitable instance, however, to cite only one, is sufficient to show that this mode of reasoning is unsafe. The Rubric next before the Apostle's Creed, both in the Morning and Evening Service, directs the standing posture, during the recital of the Creed. But no change is implied in that case; for, as is the universal practice, which is thought to be also the intention of the Church, the people were standing in the very last act, viz., the *Gloria Patri*, and the preceding Chant; and so, notwithstanding the direction, they are *not*, in that case, expected to change their posture, but continue on in the same one. So, evidently, it is in several other places. But this is enough for our present purpose.

The congregation, as directed by the Rubric, are to remain *kneeling* through the rest of the service.

The concluding Rubric in the Order of Confirmation is as follows: "And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be

confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed." This last clause, "*or be ready*," &c., was added at the review in 1661, at the request of those that were inclined to Presbyterianism. Their object, doubtless, was to depreciate the value of the rite, by not making it an indispensible prerequisite to the Holy Eucharist.

There is some difference of practice, however, arising under this Rubric; not, as I am aware, in regard to those who have grown up in our own communion, or those who intend permanently to join it. But in some parishes it is customary to allow members of other denominations, who have no intention permanently to become communicants with us, to communicate occasionally, as communicants *pro tem.*

The terms of the Rubric, however, are peremptory. It says, "there shall *none* be admitted to the Holy Communion," &c.; and must, if strictly adhered to, prohibit the reception of such persons to the Communion for a single time, as much as the reception of them for regular and habitual communicants.

No person should ever present himself for the Communion at the Altar, except such as are well known to the minister as regular communicants, until he has made known his intention, and received the express approbation and permission of the minister having charge of the parish.

But as such persons do sometimes present themselves, the minister is doubtless to receive them, *for the time*, in the judgment of charity. He cannot see their hearts, and unless he knows them to be "notorious evil livers," he ought not *there* to reject them,

and pass them by, until he has first warned them not to come to the Communion. Unless, therefore, he has *the most certain* means of knowing that the person presenting himself is not "ready and desirous to be confirmed," he should allow him to receive the Communion for the time, if his general character be otherwise good. But he should take an early opportunity to inform such persons of the instructions of the Church, by which he is bound to be guided, and of the reasons for such a rule.

We believe in "THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH:" we pray three times in the week, at least, "*from all heresy and schism, good Lord, deliver us;*" and in almost the same breath, we pray to be delivered from hardness of heart, contempt of God's Holy Word and Commandment. And on Good Friday we pray for all "infidels," that is, *un*-believers, and "heretics," that is, *mis*-believers, who are separated from the communion of the Church, that God would "have mercy on them, take from them all ignorance, hardness of heart, and contempt of His Word, and fetch them home to His flock, that so they may be saved among the remnant of the true Israelites." This is the view which the Church takes of the case, and of course it is the view which they who have engaged to conform to the doctrines, discipline, and worship of the Church in this country are bound to present and justify, whenever occasion may call for it.

If the ecclesiastical position of our Church can be justified at all, then its position, aside from the purity of its doctrines and its worship, is such as to be of an

importance that cannot well be over-estimated by him who would keep the commandments of the Lord. This is a fact which it is incumbent on us to make known on all proper occasions. It is a fact in consistency with which all of our ministerial acts should be conducted, as all of the legislative and rubrical provisions of our Church have thus far been made, and, as it is to be hoped, will ever continue to be. It could not fail to be salutary, by impressing all the members of our own communion, as well as the members of the surrounding sects, with the idea that we regard schism as a sin so great that they who have committed it cannot be received to the communion of the Church, until it has been confessed, repented of, and forsaken. And this would certainly be done better and more effectually, by the regular observance of some such rule as this, here laid down in the Rubric, than in any other way. Words generally go for but little, when the actions do not correspond.

It seems, then, that this Rubric must have been designed to keep from the communion of the Church, those who will not live in its fellowship in obedience to the laws of Christ, as well as those who, though baptized and brought up in its bosom, have not yet ratified their baptismal vows and obligations, in the presence of him with whom Christ promised His presence, and whose chief shepherd and minister in the Church Militant, next under Himself, the Bishop is acknowledged to be.

It is readily conceded, however, as a fact worthy of notice in this connection, that this Rubric was not

framed or adopted with a view to such cases as we have now been considering. Its origin I am unable to assign. In the first Book of Edward VI., it stands thus: "And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he can say the Catechism, and be confirmed." The second of Edward VI. left out the words "*can say the Catechism, and.*" At this time there were no dissenters from the English Church, and, apparently, none contemplated. And, although in 1661, at the Savoy Conference, when the spirit of dissent had become so rampant that there was every reason to expect the continued existence of dissenting communions, yet it does not appear that the clause then added, "*or be ready and desirous to be confirmed,*" was added with reference to those who had no design to become, by Confirmation, both finally and permanently reconciled to the communion of the Catholic Church. Nor do I find any reason to suppose that our reviewers, in 1789, retained the Rubric in its present form with special reference to the members of these outstanding sects.

We are left, then, to the letter of the Rubric, interpreted by the general spirit and intention of the Prayer Book. It does not say, "*none shall be received as communicants,*" that is, statedly, but "*none shall be admitted to the Holy Communion,*" &c. It might be conceded, that once communing does not make a communicant. But the Rubric is exclusive of *the one act*, as well as of the habitual communion which would make one a regular communicant. So much for the letter of the law.

As to the spirit of the Prayer Book. There can be no doubt, that it teaches that heresy and schism are very great sins. These sins, in the language of HOOKER, are as follows: Heresy, when "they loose [break] the bond of faith, which then they are justly supposed to do, when they frowardly oppugn any principal point of Christian doctrine." Schism, "when they break the bond of unity whereby the body of the Church is coupled and knit into one, as they do which wilfully forsake all external communion with saints in holy exercises, purely and orderly established in the Church." Two Sermons on Jude 17—21, p. 600, vol. 2d, Oxford Ed. 1839.

I admit, however, that it may be a question, whether these persons are to be regarded as either heretics or schismatics; that they do "frowardly oppugn" the doctrine of the Unity of the Church, at the least, which is a "principal point," being included as an article of the Faith in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, is true of them all. They also "break the bond of unity," and "wilfully forsake external communion with the Church." But if we deny the validity of their baptism, we cannot consider them as either heretics or schismatics; for both heresy and schism are sins which presuppose, as indispensable to their commission, the previous admission of the offenders to the communion of the Church by that Holy Sacrament. If, then, they are unbaptized, the question is at once settled, as no unbaptized person can be admitted to the Communion. But if we grant that they are baptized, they are both heretics and schismatics.

None are invited to the Communion, except such as "do truly and earnestly repent of their sins, intending to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in His holy ways." But such persons as we are now considering, have no such intention; they do not even confess their heresy and schism to be sins at all, still less manifest a disposition to forsake them.

The Rubric, also, before the Communion Service, must be considered as having an application here; for heresy and schism, if they be sins, are "open and notorious evil living," they "do harm to one's neighbor," and give just occasion to the congregation for offence, that is, stumbling. They destroy that idea of the sacredness and unity of Church communion, which is the greatest barrier against the evil influences of a corrupt world.

There can, then, I apprehend, be no doubt as to the meaning and application of this Rubric. I find nothing in its history, or in the general tenor of the Prayer Book, either to require or authorize any other construction of it than that required by the natural and literal meaning of its language.

I shall pass by, without comment, the Rubrics in the Marriage Service, as well as those in the Visitation of the Sick.

THE ORDER FOR THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

The first Rubric in this office directs that, "it shall not be used for any unbaptized adults, any who die

excommunicate, or who have laid violent hands upon themselves."

Until the last review, that is, A. D. 1661, there was no such Rubric prefixed to the Burial Service. At that review, however, the English Church prefixed a Rubric as follows: "Here it is to be noted, that the office ensuing is not to be used for any that die unbaptized, or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands upon themselves." Our reviewers have so changed it, as to admit of the use of this office at the burial of *un*-baptized infants.

It was the general opinion among the English Reformers, that even infants could not be saved without Baptism. Therefore, the English Rubric excludes *unbaptized* infants, as well as unbaptized adults, from Christian burial. Our Church, however, admits such infants to Christian burial, and thereby sanctions and adopts the more charitable view, that they are included in the covenant, and undoubtedly saved, though they not received here the sign and seal of their salvation.

Unbaptized adults are excluded, on the ground that, having never embraced Christianity, and chosen the Saviour for their portion, they have no right to be buried as Christians.

Those who die excommunicate. It is to be observed, that not all baptized persons who are not communicants, are excommunicate. By Baptism they are brought into the communion of the Church, though not admitted to the Eucharist, or the Holy Communion, until they have been confirmed, or are ready and desirous to be confirmed. Once admitted to the

communion of the Church, however, they are supposed to be in it, however wicked and unworthy, until they are separated therefrom by some act of excommunication on the part of the Church. But if they are excommunicate, they are "as heathen men and publicans," and, therefore, should not have a Christian's burial.

It is readily conceded, that, in the present lax state of discipline in the Church, many are not excommunicate, who ought, by an official act, to have been separated from the communion of the Church. This, however, as I conceive, does not materially effect the minister's duty in regard to the use of the office under consideration. If one dies within the communion of the Church, he must be buried by the Church as one of her children.

I do not consider any act of the person himself as coming up to what is here meant as an excommunication. One may forsake the communion, and deserve excommunication. But if the Church has tolerated him, and permitted his name to stand on the books, she must bury him, even though there be no reason to hope for any thing in regard to him, except the everlasting displeasure of the Lord.

Persons who lay violent hands upon themselves. I do not here speak of those who are insane. And WHEATLEY (an authority recommended by our House of Bishops) says: "This indignity, (the refusal of Christian burial,) indeed, is only to be offered to those who lay violent hands upon themselves, *whilst they are of sound sense and mind.*" DR. BURN, in his trea-

tise on Ecclesiastical Law, *Art. Suicide*, is also of the same opinion. He says: "The reason," of this prohibition of burial to suicides, "given by common law, is, because they die in the commission of a mortal sin; and, therefore, this extendeth not to idiots, lunatics, or persons otherwise of insane mind, or children under the age of discretion."

In addition to these authorities I shall say nothing, except that perhaps the words may have reference to the intention and to the moral character of the act. We can hardly speak of what an insane person does, as his act. The will is under constraint.

One question more arises, viz., whether one is bound to consider the baptisms of the various sects as valid or not, and to receive those who have been baptized by them, as baptized persons within the purview of this Rubric.

It is my opinion, that what has been said on a subject closely akin to this, in the remarks on the office for Baptism, is applicable here. This does, indeed, bring up more directly the abstract question of the validity of such baptisms as these sects administer, than the question then before us. But this question does no more refer to the private opinion of the individual upon the subject, than the one then under discussion. The question here, as there, is, what has the Church decided, or directed? and this decision, if it can be ascertained, limits our responsibility, and should guide our action.

It is sometimes the case, that the minister buries a person, for whom the Christian Burial Service

here provided by the Church may not be used, *in the use of another form*. It is true that the Rubric does not forbid this, in terms. But it is worthy of serious consideration, whether it does not forbid it in effect, and in spirit. What right has he to go about *any thing*, for which, in general, the Church has provided a service, though she has forbidden it to be used in such cases? The prohibition was designed to mark the difference in their death and burial, as it had been in their life, between those who are within the pale of the Church, and those who are not—to deny Christian Burial to those who chose not to have themselves considered Christians while they were alive. Is it not defeating this purpose, if the minister of Christ goes, in his official capacity, to bury them as Christians, even though he do not use the service which the Church has provided?

The *Anthem* should be said or sung, *all standing*, as on other occasions.

The *Lesson*, taken out of 1 Cor. xv. 20, should be announced and concluded as the Lessons in the Morning and Evening Prayer.

On one other point only, in these Rubrics, shall I remark.

The second Rubric before the service says: "The minister, meeting the corpse at the entrance of the church-yard, and going before it, *either* into the church, *or* towards the grave," &c. Here, evidently, a discretion is allowed. He may either go into the church first, and perform the services appropriate to the church, viz., the Anthem, Lesson, and Sermon, if there be one,

and then proceed to the grave; or, he may go first to the grave, saying the versicles, "*I am the resurrection*," &c as he goes, and *after* he has buried the corpse, and said all that is directed to be said at the grave, he may go into the church, and there perform the part appropriate to the church.

The Rubric seems designed to allow a discretion in this matter. There are often cases where it is best, and in every way desirable, to bury the body before going into the church. This is sometimes (perhaps oftener than we are aware) necessary, to protect the friends and congregation from the baleful miasma so often proceeding from a corpse, agitated by the recent movement, spreading disease and death among those that would otherwise be healthy.

I have now concluded the Additions to Bishop Mant's book, which I have ventured to make. I offer them, as I have before said, with great and unfeigned diffidence. The need of something of the kind is confessed by all. It is to be hoped, that this want may soon be supplied, by those who can speak with authority. I send these remarks forth for the present and would say, in the language of Horace, though applied by him to a very different subject—

"Si quid novisti rectius istis
Candidus imperti: si non, his utere mecum."

APPENDIX.

The following paragraphs were omitted, until it was too late to insert them in their appropriate places.

POSTURE DURING PSALMODY.

In regard to the *Posture during Psalmody*, the House of Bishops proposed, and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies approved, of the following recommendation, at the General Convention of 1814:

"Whereas, a diversity of custom has of late years prevailed in the posture of ministers and of the people, during the act of singing the Psalms and the Hymns in metre; the former practice of sitting, during this part of the service, gradually giving way to the more comely posture of standing; it is hereby recommended, by this Convention, that it be considered as the duty of the ministers of this Church, to encourage the use of the latter posture, and to induce the members of their congregations, as circumstances may permit, to do the same: allowance to be made for cases in which it may be considered inconvenient, by age or by infirmity. Practice, under this recommendation, is to begin from the time when suitable information shall have been given by the clergy to their

respective flocks. And it shall be the duty of every minister to give notice of this recommendation to his congregation at such time as in his discretion may be most proper.

"The carrying into effect of the contemplated change may be delayed by the bishop of any diocese, or, where there is no bishop, by the ecclesiastical authority therein, until there shall have been time and opportunity of explaining satisfactorily the grounds of the measure."

ANTE-COMMUNION NOT TO BE OMITTED.

As early as 1821, the omission of the Ante-Communion Service on Sundays, and other Holy Days, had prevailed to some extent. The House of Bishops communicated to the Lower House their disapprobation of the omission and of the misconstruction of the Rubric, (the last but one in the Communion Service,) by which it was excused. After giving their reasons at some length, they conclude: "The Bishops, therefore, deem it their duty to express the decided opinion, that the Rubrics of the Communion Service, as well as other general considerations, enjoin the use of that part which precedes the Sermon, *on all occasions* of Sermon or Communion, as well as on those festivals and fasts when neither Sermon or Communion occurs." This is to be understood, of course, only of Morning Prayer, and the Rubric itself (as will be seen by turning to it) requires the part of

the Ante-Communion Service here spoken of, "*on all Sundays, and other Holy Days, if there be no Sermon or Communion.*"

In the Convention of 1826, an action was taken by which, as Bishop WHITE says, "the sense of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies is now declared, in favor of what the Bishops have all along, and that unanimously, declared to be the meaning of the Rubric," viz., that the Rubric just cited does positively require the Ante-Communion Service, to the end of the Gospel, to be used on all Sundays and other Holy Days when there is a Service in the morning at all. WHITE'S *Memoirs of the Prot. Ep. Church*, pp. 53, 245, 255, 378, &c., Ed. 1836.

This expression of opinion, by the Bishops, and by the whole Convention, must be regarded, I apprehend, as entirely decisive on the point of obligation to use the Ante-Communion Service on all those days for which one is provided.

The hypothetic clause, as Bishop White says, was introduced to meet the case of services without either Sermon or Communion, and was not at all intended to affect the practice when there is either Sermon or Communion. It only provides for an ending of the service, if there is neither Sermon nor Communion.

II.

LITURGICAL HARMONY:

ITS OBLIGATIONS, MEANS, AND SECURITY AGAINST ERROR WHETHER POPISH OR PURITANICAL.

IN A

CHARGE TO CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS.

"And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned, except he strive LAWFULLY.' 2 Tim. ii. 5.

"Of Law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is the bosom of God: her voice the harmony of the world. All things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempt from her power: both angels, and men, and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy." (HOOKER'S *Ecc. Polity*, B. I. at the end.)

GENTLEMEN AND BRETHREN,

On occasions, like the present, of examination, with a view to the admission of candidates for the ministry to that holy order, to which they are respectively desirous of being admitted, it has been generally my practice, after their examination, to draw their attention to the engagement on which they are about to enter. And this has been done, sometimes by a written address, sometimes by interlocutory observations, with reference for the most part to the excellent offices which the Church has provided, for the ordaining of priests and deacons. These offices cannot be too strongly recommended to your most serious meditations, whether as an immediate preparation for the approaching solemnity, or a perpetual guide in all your future ministrations. I shall be content, however, with this transient commendation of the Ordination Forms, and shall make it my present business to direct your thoughts to certain other portions of our Book of Common Prayer, which are apt, I

think, not to be examined with that care to which they are entitled, but which do in reality contain much valuable matter; matter especially important for the use of those, who are about to engage, or are already engaged, in the Church's ministry.

The particulars, of which I speak, are those preliminary or prefatory statements, which stand before our provisions for divine service, and comprise indeed the views by which those provisions have been and are regulated. They are, as specified in the Table of Contents of the Common Prayer Book, "The Acts for the Uniformity of Common Prayer; The Preface; Concerning the Service of the Church; and Concerning Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained."* In this order they stand in the Book, but the order is not chronological. The two Acts for "the Uniformity of Common Prayer and Service in the Church, and the Administration of the Sacraments," were passed respectively

* See these Documents in the Appendix at the end of this Charge.

in the 1st year of Queen Elizabeth, and in the 14th of King Charles the Second, being the years of our Lord 1559 and 1662. "The Preface," being the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, as revised, and altered, and added to, and finally enacted, after the King's Restoration, is of the same date as the Act of Parliament then passed, namely, 1662. The two succeeding Articles, "Concerning the Service of the Church," and "Concerning Ceremonies," are of an earlier date, having been continued from Q. Elizabeth's Book, whither indeed they had been transferred from the two Books of King Edward the Sixth: in all of which they formed and were called "The Preface:" though that name being afterwards given to the preliminary notice or introduction to the revised Book in 1662, the articles, which had been so denominated in 1559, in Q. Elizabeth's Book, then came to be designated by the titles, which I have cited from the actual Table of Contents. All these contents of our Book of Common Prayer have, however, in the present day the like

convocational and parliamentary authority, being all incorporated in that Book as revised and adopted in 1662. But the difference between them in point of chronology is worthy of being remembered, as illustrative of their several observations, and calculated to assist us in better understanding and more fitly applying them: forasmuch as the earlier Preface, now called "Concerning the Service of the Church" and "Concerning Ceremonies," being originally written in K. Edward's reign and afterwards adopted early in Q. Elizabeth's, had special reference to the Romish corruptions; not, however, without regard to then modern innovators and objectors: whereas that, which is now called "The Preface," had more particular regard to puritanical objections; to those "vain attempts and impetuous assaults made against the Liturgy of the Church," "during the then late unhappy confusions," "by such men as were given to change."

In these authoritative compositions are contained certain principles, accompanied by certain injunctions, which well deserve

the observance and obedience of the ministers of the Church, and to which I now beg your attention.

1. The first, which I shall specify, is, the importance and the rule of "Uniformity in public prayers," as derived from the Acts made for that purpose, especially the Act of the 14th and 15th of K. Charles II., as passed in England, or of the 17th and 18th of that King, passed in Ireland to much the same effect: the importance, I say, of such uniformity, "in regard," as the Act states, "that nothing conduceth more to the settling of the peace of the nation, (which is desired of all good men,) nor to the honor of our religion, and the propagation thereof, than an universal agreement in the public worship of Almighty God;" and the rule of such uniformity, forasmuch as the Act enjoins, that "all and singular ministers . . . . shall be bound to say and use the Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, Celebration and Administration of both the Sacraments, and all other the public and common prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said Book annexed and joined to this present Act, and

intituled the Book of Common Prayer," and so forth.

This, which is the Statute law of the land, we as dutiful subjects are bound to obey. It is also specially the law of the Church: for her judgment, as delivered in her Canons, both English and Irish, is, that "That Form of Liturgy, or divine service, and no other, shall be used in any church of this realm, but that which is established by the law, and comprised in the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments."

And this law of the Realm and of the Church, we are by our personal obligations engaged to follow. You who are about to be admitted to the Holy Order of Deacons, before being admitted are required "by subscription to declare your consent" to the aforesaid Canon, "and to every thing contained therein;" thereby pledging yourselves to use "the prescript form of divine service in the Book of Common Prayer, and none other." You who are about to be admitted to the Holy Order of Priests, having at your former ordination declared your

consent, are now again required, before your admission, to subscribe the same declaration, and thus to repeat the same pledge. And at the time of your admission you will be required to promise conformity to the same rule of divine service: for then the Bishop will demand of you, in the name of God and of his Church, and in the presence of the congregation of Christ there assembled, "Whether you will give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the Commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your cure and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same?" And you will be called upon to answer, "I will so do, by the help of the Lord." I might dwell upon the like obligations to conformity, which are incurred by every clergyman upon every admission to a cure or a benefice. But, on the present occasion, a reference may be more appropriately made to the engagement which precedes and accom-

panies your ordination as ministers of Christ and of his Church: I therefore solemnly warn and premonish you, that you will be admitted to your several orders in the Church upon the faith of your express stipulation, that you will "conform to the prescript Form of divine service in the Church's Book of Common Prayer, that and no other." The consequence of ministerial non-conformity I would moreover impress upon your minds: that I will express it in the words of excellent ritualist, Archdeacon Sharp, who observed near a century ago, "that, excepting a very few cases, or under some necessary limitations and reservations, we are bound to adhere to the law of the Church in the Rubric literally, punctually, and perpetually: and that whosoever among the clergy either adds to it, or diminishes from it, or useth any other rule instead of it, as he is in the eye of the law so far a non-conformist, so it behoves him to consider with himself, whether in point of conscience he be not a breaker of his word and trust, and an eluder of his engagements to the Church."

2. Whilst I thus remind you of an obligation which has been or will be incurred by you, (or rather I should say by us, for I hold myself fully as much bound by the obligation, as I hold any one of you: however whilst I thus remind you of the minister's duty of adhering to the prescript order of the Church,) in the ministration of her public services, I would beg you to treasure up in your recollection the judgment which the Church delivers upon those, who take to themselves the liberty of setting up their own wills in opposition to her decrees. In one division of the original "Preface" to K. Edward's and Q. Elizabeth's Books, distinguished in our present Common Prayer Book by the title, "Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained," we are informed of the discrimination exercised at the Reformation by public authority, as for the rejection of some such ceremonies as had been used in the Church, so for the reservation of others, "as well for a decent order in the Church, (for the which they were at first devised,) as because they pertain to edification, whereunto all things,

done in the Church, (as the Apostle teacheth,) ought to be referred."

Whereupon the judgment proceeds—"And although the keeping or omitting of a ceremony, in itself considered, is but a small thing; yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God. 'Let all things be done among you,' saith St. Paul, 'in a seemly and due order:' The appointment of which order pertaineth not to private men; therefore no man ought to take in hand, nor presume to appoint or alter any public or common Order in Christ's Church, except he be lawfully called and authorized thereunto." You see then here the sentence which the Church pronounces upon a wilful transgression or alteration of her ordinances by private unauthorized individuals. As by your previous undertaking you are bound to observe her ordinances, so by her declaration here you are admonished to regard a violation of them, as a breaking of her discipline, and therein as "no small offence before God." The same principle is set forth and enforced

in one of the 39 Articles, the 34th, to which on this occasion of your ordination you are required to testify your consent. The position is, "Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that others may fear to do the like,) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren." I would earnestly entreat you to ponder carefully, and to recollect continually, these decisions, under a solemn sense of your responsibility incurred at this season to God and his Church. And if at any time you be tempted, whether in compliance with the wishes, persuasions, or example of others, or, in a word, from the prospect of some imaginary good, to take your private judgment for a rule instead of the Church's ordinances, I would earnestly again entreat you to weigh well, whether you be at liberty to incur the

evil consequences, of which the Church deliberately and authoritatively forewarns you, as results of your forfeiture of your ordination pledge.

3. I am supposing that the rules and orders of the Church are plain, as indeed they are in almost all cases of ministerial practice, and that your path of duty lies clear and straight before you. But the question naturally arises, what is a clergyman to do, where his duty is less accurately defined, and less easy therefore to be discerned and followed?

The possibility of the question was foreseen, and an answer has been anticipated, by the Church in the other division of the original Preface to her Common Prayer Book, that, namely, which is intituled, "Concerning the Service of the Church." "And forasmuch," she observes, "as nothing can be so plainly set forth, but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same; to appease all such diversity (if any arise) and for the resolution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute, the things contained in this

Book: the parties that so doubt, or diversely take any thing, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to any thing contained in this Book. And if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop." The duty of compliance with the Diocesan's judgment is necessarily involved in this reference: for otherwise the reference would be idle and nugatory altogether: and the avowed object of the Church in directing it, for "the appeasing, that is of all diversity, and for the resolution of all doubts," would be defeated. But compliance is moreover expressly bound upon you by your general promise at your several ordinations: for on your admission, first to deacons' and then to priests' orders, you plight your faith, that you "will, the Lord being your helper, reverently obey your Ordinary: following with a glad mind and will his godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to his godly judgments."

Thus in all dubious and ambiguous, as

well as in all clear and indisputable cases, the Church provides for Uniformity in her ministers' celebration of divine service. The provision is calculated to strengthen and comfort them in the conscientious discharge of their engagements, and to be a relief, a warrant, and a security on uncertain points, by exonerating them from the weight of a distressing decision; and by, not permitting them only or advising them, but bidding and directing them to cast the burden upon one, who is thereupon charged with the obligation, as he is invested with the authority, to decide. Such references honestly made and faithfully acted upon, would by God's blessing be greatly conducive to the satisfying of scruples, the smoothing of difficulties, the avoiding of offences, the establishment and continuance of good order and harmony amongst brethren in a diocese, and so to the honor of Almighty God and the well-being of his Church. I would therefore advise and exhort, that in case of "any doubts which may arise in the use and practice" of the Book of Common Prayer, "for the appeasing of all such diversity and for the

solution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute, the things contained therein;" you, or any one of you, who may "so doubt or diversely take any thing," do "alway resort to the Bishop" of your diocese, and be directed to your conclusion and ordered in it "by his discretion." Upon the grounds already stated, this appears to be required of you in dubious and disputed cases: I add as a corollary, that still more is acquiescence in your Diocesan's judgment imperative, in cases unambiguous and unquestionable, where his sentence is given for enforcing the plain and precise and positive rules of the Church.

4. The preliminary documents in our Book of Common Prayer may be moreover useful, as admonishing us concerning two classes of error, which heretofore interfered with the due celebration of divine worship, and from the danger of which we of this day are not exempt.

The original Preface "Concerning the Service of the Church" condemns the mediæval departure from the primæval usage of the Church, which was wont to give reli-

gious instruction "of a good purpose and for a great advancement in godliness," by means of the Holy Scriptures; of the Holy Scriptures read, not loosely and desultorily, but regularly and systematically, in the public service. "The ancient fathers," she observes, "so ordered the matter, that all the whole Bible, or the greatest part thereof, should be read over once every year: intending thereby that the clergy, and especially such as were ministers in the congregation, should (by often reading and meditation in God's word) be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able to exhort others by wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries to the Truth; and further that the people, (by daily hearing of Holy Scripture read in the church,) might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of his true religion." To the neglect of this ancient custom she attributes the ensuing ignorance of religious truth: and she endeavors to supply a remedy by re-instituting the practice of a daily reading of the Holy Scriptures, so that the Old Tes-

tament, or the most part thereof, may be read once, and the New Testament, with a small exception, thrice, every year. This ordinance of the Church is still in being, and the argument for the use of it is still in force. We, the clergy of the Church, are not so thoroughly instructed in God's word, but that, by the daily reading of it, we may be "stirred up to godliness" ourselves, and be better enabled to "exhort and confute" others. Our people cannot be regarded, as so well trained in the knowledge of God, and so much inflamed with the love of his true religion, as not to require "the daily hearing of Holy Scripture read in the church." Among the many motives which might be alleged for observing the Church's rule of daily service, this is one: and if any of you be placed in a situation, where the use of such service is practicable, (for I do not say that it is always so,) this may operate as one inducement with you to the practice.

The same document speaks of "this godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers" having been moreover altered by "planting in uncertain stories and legends,"

with multitude of other impertinent admixtures; and of there being "left out" of the new Service Book "many things, whereof some are untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious;" and of "nothing being ordained to be read, but the very pure word of God, the Holy Scriptures, or that which is agreeable to the same." We may trust in God's goodness, that there is little peril of such a corrupt admixture being again introduced by authority into our Church services. Yet aware as we are of the high commendation, which in certain quarters has been of late bestowed on the Romish Breviary in comparison with our Book of Common Prayer; of the excessive veneration testified for the blessed Virgin; of the fondness which has betrayed itself for the devotees of celibacy and monastic institutions, and for the propagators of curious peculiarities in the middle ages; of the propensity to accredit and circulate legendary tales of saints, and to institute new commemorative services in their honor: it may be not altogether an unreasonable suggestion, which should caution you against the

custom, that formerly prevailed, of mixing up for popular instruction human fables and fictions with divine truth.

Another and a kindred abuse which had polluted the Church, as noticed in the earlier Preface, was that of Ceremonies, superabundant in number, of nature most reprehensible. The Preface thus describes them. "Of such ceremonies, as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning by the institution of man, some at the first were of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and superstition: some entered into the Church by undiscreet devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge: and for because they were winked at in the beginning, they grew daily to more and more abuses, which not only for their unprofitableness, but also because they have much blinded the people, and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut away and clean rejected." Thus the extravagant and intolerable multitude of ceremonies, and the darkness of many of them being such, "that they did more confound and obscure than declare and set

forth Christ's benefits unto us," demanded their diminution: but the most weighty cause of the abolishment of certain of them was, "that they were so far abused, partly by the superstitious blindness of the rude and unlearned, and partly by the unsatiable avarice of such, as sought more their own lucre than the glory of God, that the abuses could not well be taken away, the thing remaining still." Accordingly retaining only such as were edifying and inoffensive, the Church banished all others, so that her people might be "reduced to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition."

Specimens of these objectionable rites will occur to you in the innumerable and reiterated gesticulations of the officiating priests, and the variety and continual changes of the sacerdotal vestments: in the exorcisms and chrisms used in holy baptism: in the reserving, carrying about, lifting up, and worshipping of the consecrated bread and wine in the holy communion: in the kissings of the pax, and the creepings to the cross: in the telling of beads: in the hallowing of bells: in the

multitudinous bowings and crossings of the person: in the sprinklings of holy water: in the ringing of little hand bells, and the lighting of numerous candles, and the burning of incense during divine service: in the worshipping and adoration of images and reliques, as well as of saints: in the dressing of images and pictures: and in the superfluous and excessive decking of churches. If not altogether in exact form, yet in spirit, a disposition has appeared in recent times for reverting to some at least of these. On all such questions the Church should be our guide. Some of these ceremonial observances she has rejected as being repugnant to the word of God: some as obscuring God's glory: some as giving occasion for vanity and many superstitions. But in any case our obedience to her is due: and what she has repudiated you may be assured that you ought not to adopt.

5. Meanwhile there are other ceremonies which the Church has preserved, and which her ministers therefore cannot be justified in declining. In the Preface "Of Ceremonies," the subject is set forth to be

"why some be abolished, and some retained." And accordingly whilst she pronounces, that for reasons there assigned some are "worthy to be cut away and clean rejected," she professes also that "other there be, which, although they have been devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still, as well for a decent Order in the Church, (for the which they were first devised,) as because they pertain to edification, whereunto all things done in the Church (as the Apostle teacheth) ought to be referred." In the course of the Preface she animadverts on some men, "so new-fangled, that they would innovate all things, and so despise the old, that nothing can like them but what is new." And she gives reasons for her retaining and selecting these in the considerations, that "without some ceremonies it is not possible to keep any order or quiet discipline in the Church;" and that whereas "those be taken away which were most abused, and did burden men's consciences without any cause, so the other that remain are retained for a discipline and order, which upon just causes may be altered and changed."

Some of the remarks indeed in this document had reference rather to the 1st Book of K. Edward the 6th, wherein they first appeared, and wherein were retained several ceremonies which have been since omitted: such for example was the trine immersion of infants in baptism, first dipping the right side, second the left side, the third time dipping the face toward the font; the mixing of a little pure and clean water with the wine, for the celebration of the Lord's Supper; the offering of prayers for the dead: concerning which it may be transiently remarked, that, if there were no other reasons for our discontinuing them, though indeed strong independent reasons may be given for such discontinuance, especially with respect to praying for the dead; yet it would be a sufficient argument for our forbearance, that the Church has abolished and ceased to retain them. Meantime the continued preservation and repetition of the remarks show, that the Church judges the remarks to be applicable to her service as it has been since altered; and they still supply us with

principles and rules for our conduct, as to such ceremonies as are still in being.

In truth, both at that early period of the Reformation and during succeeding ages, the Church has been in conflict with her opponents, both as to her ceremonies more strictly so called, and as to her form in general of divine worship. The last, and to us now the most momentous conflict, was that which occurred after the restoration of King Charles the Second, when, the use of the Liturgy having been during the late unhappy confusions illegally discontinued, those men, who under the late usurped powers had been active in rendering the people disaffected thereunto, namely, the presbyterian nonconformists, renewed their utmost endeavors to hinder its restitution. Thus divers pamphlets were published against the Book of Common Prayer: old objections were revived; new ones were added. And in fine the King was importuned, that the Book might be revised, and subjected to "such alterations and additions as should be thought requisite for the ease of tender consciences."

It was then that the revision of the Book was committed to some of the most learned Churchmen of the day, who with commendable moderation entered on an examination of the Book, and of the objections alleged against it. "Of the sundry alterations proposed they rejected all such, as were either of dangerous consequence, (as secretly striking at some established doctrine, or laudable practice, of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholic Church of Christ;) or else of no consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vain. But to such alterations as seemed to them in any degree requisite or expedient they willingly assented:" "their general aim being," as they affirmed, "to do that, which to their best understandings they conceived might most tend to the preservation of peace and unity in the Church; the procuring of reverence, and exciting of piety and devotion in the public worship of God; and the cutting off occasion from them that seek occasion of cavil or quarrel against the Liturgy of the Church."

The Book, having been thus prepared,

was submitted to the consideration of the Convocations of both Provinces in England, and by them with great diligence examined and approved. It was then enacted to be part of the law of the land by the Act of Uniformity: and it was then laid before the public with that "Preface," which has since stood immediately after the Act of Uniformity, and before the other earlier prefatory articles; and in the course of which the writers give an account of their proceedings, concluding with "a good hope, that what is there presented will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England." The Book was soon after adopted by both houses of convocation in Ireland, and made the subject of a legislative enactment there also.

This is the Book, to which we certify our assent and consent; to which we promise conformity; and which we are bound to follow without addition or diminution, upon the general principle on which I have already dwelt. But there is a particular consideration, arising out of the historical

circumstances of the Book, which lays us under a particular obligation.

Objections had been raised against some of the Church's previous provisions: deviations from them had been sought and proposed. These were submitted to the examination of the Church's representatives, duly authorized to deliberate and decide upon them. Such alterations then, as appeared in any degree requisite or expedient, were admitted: others, which were either of dangerous consequence, or else of no consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vain, were rejected. Whilst we are in duty bound to receive the former, the latter, if they should happen to be revived, and brought under our notice, and recommended for our adoption, we are no less bound in duty to reject: to reject them, not merely because they are at variance with the general order of the Church; but because, having been submitted, as we know, to special examination, they were marked with special disapprobation.

Thus, that I may briefly touch on a few examples, wherein the Church rejected pro-

posed alterations, and adhered to her previous provisions, in the general service she maintained her usage of alternate reading, repetitions, and responses between the minister and people, as likewise of the Litany, instead of suffering them to be changed into a long continuous prayer; she persisted in her liturgical forms to the exclusion of all discretionary or extemporary effusions; she retained her religious observation of the season of Lent, her saints' days or holydays, her lessons from the Apocrypha, her surplice as the ministerial habit, (the only ministerial habit authorized by her or recognized,) and her expression of charitable hope for the departed, notwithstanding the attempt made by her opponents to abolish these provisions from her ritual: in her ministration of baptism, notwithstanding conflicting efforts to the contrary, she continued to require the suretyship of sponsors different from the parents of the children, and to prescribe the use of the sign of the cross on the forehead of the baptized, and to retain her form for receiving into the congregation children whom in cases of "great cause and necessity" she

allowed to be "privately baptized:" and, notwithstanding speculative objections to the contrary, she continued to make distinct avowal of the doctrine, that every child, who is rightly baptized, is regenerated by God's Holy Spirit; perpetually repeating that doctrine in other parts of her service, and never allowing any other regeneration distinct from the grace of baptism: and in her ministration of the holy communion, she prescribed and justified the posture of kneeling for the communicants; notwithstanding the plea of the objectors, that the minister should direct himself at all times towards the people, she persevered in ordering, that he should "turn" at certain times "towards the people," and at others "towards the Lord's holy table;" and notwithstanding the desire of the objectors, that, at the distribution to the communicants, the minister be not required to "deliver the bread and wine into every particular communicant's hand, and to repeat the words to each one in the singular number, but that it may suffice to speak them to divers jointly," the Church persisted in her previous order for

a "several" delivery of the bread and wine and the "several" repetition of the words. to "each communicant," marking at the same time by a small verbal alteration her own strong and deliberate sense of the fitness of the usage, to which the dissenters objected.

The alteration, to which I allude, is, as you are doubtless already apprized, a supplemental phrase in each of the Rubrics which direct what form of words is to accompany the delivery of the sacramental elements: for whereas the former Book had directed, "When he delivereth the Bread," "And the minister that delivereth the cup," "shall say;" the direction was now rendered personally more precise, "And when he delivereth the bread *to any one*, he shall say," and again, "And the minister that delivereth the cup *to any one*, shall say." I add that he is to say the whole of the following sentence: for such is the Church's plain direction, and she allows no discretion for adhering to one part and altering the other.

I need not multiply examples of what occurred at the last review: for in these,

which I have stated, you will see sufficiently exemplified the nature of the obligation which is imposed upon us by the Church's conduct with respect to those questions which were brought before her on that the last occasion of altering her Liturgy. You see specific changes proposed on one side by those who were arrayed against her: on the other side you see her deliberately and authoritatively deciding against the proposed changes. It may be, that, in the discharge of your ministerial office, you may be tempted to adopt some or other of the changes now specified. If so, I would earnestly entreat you to reflect on what has now been said: and to consider, whether, should you be drawn into compliance with such temptation, you will not incur the guilt, not only of violating your general pledge of duty, but of taking part with dissenters in opposition to the Church's formal judgment and decree; whether therefore it would not have been better for you not to undertake the office, for which you are now candidates in the ministry of the Church, than to be thus nonconformists and unfaithful in discharging it.

Gentlemen and Brethren, I shall detain you no longer. It has been my object to impress upon your minds your duty of maintaining uniformity in the Church's services: the character of a wilful transgression of her common order and discipline: your privilege and duty of referring questionable matters to your Diocesan: your duty lastly of rejecting whatever the Church has rejected and abolished, and of adhering to and practising whatever she has retained and prescribes.

The subject, on which I have now addressed you, having been taken up on limited ground, has been treated imperfectly; but enough perhaps has been said to awaken serious thoughts thereon, wherewith you may "commune in your own hearts and in your chamber." Deem me not your enemy if I have endeavored to tell you the truth: rather deem of me as one of your best friends, for that I have sought to forewarn you of danger, and to assist you in avoiding it. Even at this late hour it were better for you not to engage in the office which you seek, unless you resolve sincerely, and labor diligently, with God's help to exe-

cute it with fidelity. But I hope better things: I trust, that what you solemnly promise you will intend honestly, and conscientiously perform. In that confidence I bid you God-speed: and now commend you to the blessing of our heavenly Father, under the sanctifying influence of his Holy Spirit, in his blessed Son, our only Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

Whilst this little Book is passing through the Press, I am favored with a copy of a Tract by the Dean of Down, entitled "The Churchman's Duty." The object of it is to satisfy the minds of his parishioners as to the duty of a "faithful Son of the Church," in respect of "her authentic formulary and guide, the Book of Common Prayer." And, in pursuance of that object, he is pleased to cite "the explanation of the ordination vow of every minister of the Church." as "given with accuracy and fidelity" in extracts from his Diocesan's Charge in 1843.

To this Charge I have adverted in the second of the foregoing letters; and I earnestly entreat attention to the provisions made by the Church, and undertaken by her ministers, for liturgical conformity, as therein stated. If the reader of these letters is not possessed of the Charge itself, he may easily procure access to the most important parts of it by means of the Tract of my very reverend friend; to whom I gladly embrace the opportunity of hereby expressing my acknowledgments for his seasonable exertion "in defence of the Church's laws and constitution," as well as of "her doctrines and sacraments."

R. D. C. and D.

Christmas.

APPENDIX.

CONCERNING THE SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

THERE was never any thing by the wit of man so well devised, or so sure established, which in continuance of time hath not been corrupted: As, among other things, it may plainly appear by the Common Prayers in the Church, commonly called *Divine Service*. The first original and ground whereof if a man would search out by the ancient Fathers, he shall find, that the same was not ordained but of a good purpose, and for a great advancement of godliness. For they so ordered the matter, that all the whole Bible, (or the greatest part thereof,) should be read over once every year; intending thereby, that the Clergy, and especially such as were Ministers in the congregation, should (by often reading, and meditation in God's word) be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able to exhort others by wholesome Doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries to the Truth; and further, that the people (by daily hearing of holy Scripture read in the church) might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of his true religion.

But these many years passed, this godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers hath been so altered, broken, and neglected, by planting in uncertain Stories, and Legends, with multitude of Responds, Verses, vain Repetitions, Commemorations, and Synodals; that commonly when any Book of the Bible was begun, after three or four Chapters were read out, all the rest were unread. And in this sort the Book of *Isaiah* was begun in *Advent*, and the Book of *Genesis* in *Septuagesima*; but they were only begun, and never read through: After like sort were other Books of holy Scripture used. And moreover, whereas Saint *Paul* would have such language spoken to the people in the Church, as they might

understand, and have profit by hearing the same; The Service in this Church of *England* these many years hath been read in Latin to the people, which they understand not; so that they have heard with their ears only, and their heart, spirit, and mind, have not been edified thereby. And furthermore, notwithstanding that the ancient Fathers have divided the *Psalms* into seven portions, whereof every one was called a *Nocturn:* Now of late time a few of them have been daily said, and the rest utterly omitted. Moreover, the number and hardness of the rules called the *Pie,* and the manifold changings of the Service, was the cause, that to turn the Book only was so hard and intricate a matter, that many times there was more business to find out what should be read, than to read it when it was found out.

These inconveniences therefore considered, here is set forth such an Order, whereby the same shall be redressed. And for a readiness in this matter, here is drawn out a Calendar for that purpose, which is plain and easy to be understood; wherein (so much as may be) the reading of holy Scripture is so set forth, that all things shall be done in order, without breaking one piece from another. For this cause be cut off Anthems, Responds, Invitatories, and such like things as did break the continual course of the reading of the Scripture.

Yet, because there is no remedy, but that of necessity there must be some Rules; therefore certain rules are here set forth; which, as they are few in number, so they are plain and easy to be understood. So that here you have an Order for Prayer, and for the reading of the holy Scripture, much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers, and a great deal more profitable and commodious, than that which of late was used. It is more profitable, because here are left out many things, whereof some are untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious; and nothing is ordained to be read, but the very pure Word of God, the holy Scriptures, or that which is agreeable to the same; and that in such a Language and order as is most easy and plain for the understanding both of the Readers and Hearers. It is also more commodious, both for the shortness thereof, and for the plainness of the Order, and for that the Rules be few and easy.

And whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in

saying and singing in churches within this Realm; some following *Salisbury* Use, some *Hereford* Use, and some the Use of *Bangor*, some of *York*, some of *Lincoln*; now from henceforth all the whole Realm shall have but one Use.

And forasmuch as nothing can be so plainly set forth, but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same; to appease all such diversity (if any arise) and for the resolution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute, the things contained in this Book; the parties that so doubt, or diversly take any thing, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to any thing contained in this Book. And if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop.

THOUGH it be appointed, that all things shall be read and sung in the Church in the *English* Tongue, to the end that the congregation may be thereby edified; yet it is not meant, but that when men say Morning and Evening Prayer privately, they may say the same in any language that they themselves do understand.

And all Priests and Deacons are to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer either privately or openly, not being let by sickness, or some other urgent cause.

And the Curate that ministereth in every Parish-Church or Chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the Parish-Church or Chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a Bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's Word, and to pray with him.

OF CEREMONIES,

WHY SOME BE ABOLISHED, AND SOME RETAINED.

OF such Ceremonies as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning by the institution of man, some at the first were of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and

superstition: some entered into the Church by undiscreet devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge; and for because they were winked at in the beginning, they grew daily to more and more abuses, which not only for their unprofitableness, but also because they have much blinded the people, and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut away, and clean rejected: other there be, which although they have been devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still, as well for a decent order in the Church, (for the which they were at first devised,) as because they pertain to edification, whereunto all things done in the Church (as the Apostle teacheth) ought to be referred.

And although the keeping or omitting of a Ceremony, in itself considered, is but a small thing; yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God, *Let all things be done among you*, saith Saint *Paul*, *in a seemly and due order:* The appointment of the which order pertaineth not to private men; therefore no man ought to take in hand, nor presume to appoint or alter any public or common Order in Christ's Church, except he be lawfully called and authorized thereunto.

And whereas in this our time, the minds of men are so diverse, that some think it a great matter of conscience to depart from a piece of the least of their Ceremonies, they be so addicted to their old customs; and again on the other side, some be so new-fangled, that they would innovate all things, and so despise the old, that nothing can like them, but that is new: it was thought expedient, not so much to have respect how to please and satisfy either of these parties, as how to please God, and profit them both. And yet lest any man should be offended, whom good reason might satisfy, here be certain causes rendered, why some of the accustomed Ceremonies be put away, and some retained and kept still.

Some are put away, because the great excess and multitude of them hath so increased in these latter days, that the burden of them was intolerable; whereof Saint *Augustine* in his time complained, that they were grown to such a number, that the estate of Christian people was in worse case concerning that matter, than were the Jews. And he counselled that such yoke and burden should be taken away, as time would serve quietly to do it.

But what would Saint *Augustine* have said, if he had seen the Ceremonies of late days used among us; whereunto the multitude used in his time was not to be compared? This our excessive multitude of Ceremonies was so great, and many of them so dark, that they did more confound and darken, than declare and set forth Christ's benefits unto us. And besides this, Christ's Gospel is not a Ceremonial Law, (as much of *Moses'* Law was,) but it is a Religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit; being content only with those Ceremonies which do serve to a decent Order and godly Discipline, and such as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification, whereby he might be edified. Furthermore, the most weighty cause of the abolishment of certain Ceremonies was, That they were so far abused, partly by the superstitious blindness of the rude and unlearned, and partly by the unsatiable avarice of such as sought more their own lucre, than the glory of God, that the abuses could not well be taken away, the thing remaining still.

But now as concerning those persons, which peradventure will be offended, for that some of the old Ceremonies are retained still: If they consider that without some Ceremonies it is not possible to keep any Order, or quiet Discipline in the Church, they shall easily perceive just cause to reform their judgments. And if they think much, that any of the old do remain, and would rather have all devised anew: then such men granting some Ceremonies convenient to be had, surely where the old may be well used, there they cannot reasonably reprove the old only for their age, without bewraying of their own folly. For in such a case they ought rather to have reverence unto them for their antiquity, if they will declare themselves to be more studious of unity and concord, than of innovations and new-fangleness, which (as much as may be with true setting forth of Christ's Religion) is always to be eschewed. Furthermore, such shall have no just cause with the Ceremonies reserved to be offended. For as those be taken away which were most abused, and did burden men's consciences without any cause; so the other that remain, are retained for a discipline and order, which (upon just cause) may be altered and changed, and there-

fore are not to be esteemed equal with God's Law. And moreover, they be neither dark nor dumb Ceremonies, but are so set forth, that every man may understand what they do mean, and to what use they do serve. So that it is not like that they in time to come should be abused as other have been. And in these our doings we condemn no other Nations, nor prescribe any thing but to our own people only: For we think it convenient that every Country should use such Ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honor and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition; and that they should put away other things, which from time to time they perceive to be most abused, as in men's ordinances it often chanceth diversly in divers countries.

(LIT)
1900K
M318.4

Mant, Richard. Bp.

Explanation of the rubrics

~~R64.03~~ Lit
~~M31.4~~ 1900K
M318.4